

ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE.

INCORPORATED A.D. 1720.

FIRE, LIFE, SEA, ACCIDENTS, BURGLARY, ANNUITIES,
EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY
(Including ACCIDENTS to DOMESTIC SERVANTS).

The Corporation will act as:—

EXECUTOR OF WILLS.

TRUSTEE OF WILLS AND SETTLEMENTS.

Special Terms granted to ANNUITANTS when health is impaired.

Apply for Full Prospectus to the Secretary.

Head Office: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST

SOCIETY, LIMITED.

THANET HOUSE, 231-232 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

(OPPOSITE THE LAW COURTS).

REMOVED FROM NO. 24 LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1853.

Capital Stock £400,000

Debenture Stock £308,130

REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.

*Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Office.
W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.*

PHOENIX ASSURANCE CO., Ltd.

PHOENIX FIRE OFFICE.

ESTABLISHED 1782.

19, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

FIRE.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

BURGLARY. PERSONAL ACCIDENT.

FIDELITY GUARANTEE.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS	-	-	-	-	£5,500,000
INCOME	-	-	-	-	£722,000
YEARLY BUSINESS	-	-	-	-	£2,790,000
BUSINESS IN FORCE	-	-	-	-	£21,000,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WITHOUT PROFITS.

The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 %	30	£1 16 %	40	£2 10 %

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c. — Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,438	£1,724	£2,067

Full information on application to

THE MANAGER, 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, JUNE 8, 1907.

* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.
All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Notice.

A Digest of all the Cases reported in the "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter" during the legal year 1906-1907, containing references to the Law Reports, will be issued weekly, as a Supplement, during the months of August and September.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	523	CORRESPONDENCE	529
SETTING ASIDE CHAMBERS ORDERS IN CHANCERY	526	SOCIETIES	532
ADCEPTION OF LEGACIES BY EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE	527	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	533
THE CONVEYANCING AND SETTLED LAND BILLS	528	LEGAL NEWS	534
REVIEWS	529	WINDING-UP NOTICES	535
		COURT PAPERS	536
		CREDITORS' NOTICES	538
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	540

Cases Reported this Week.

Allinson v. Cumberland County Council	532
Caswell and Another v. Cheshire Lines Committee	532
Grimshaw's Divorce (Validation) Bill	529
Guardians of the Fulham Union v. Guardians of the Woolwich Union	529
Lett v. Lett	532
Levene v. Maton	532
Lloyd and Wife v. Great Western and Metropolitan Dairies (Lim.) and Another	530
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board v. Owners of the Steamship "Marpeesa"	530
Samuel Lewis (Deceased), Re. Davies v. Harrison	531
Wilson v. Carnley	531

Current Topics.

The Small Holdings and Allotments Bill.

IT SEEMS pretty clear that the two points over which controversy will take place in the House of Lords, when the Government Small Holdings Bill reaches the Upper House, are "compulsion" and "hiring." Already a vigorous protest has been made by Lord LANSDOWNE against the inclusion in the Bill of the principle of compulsion. Theoretically, perhaps, there may be no more sound reasons against compulsory "hiring" than against compulsory "purchase," but the scheme of taking land on lease by compulsion is an altogether new departure in experimental legislation, and the practical working of the novel provisions of the Bill on this subject may prove to be difficult. The systems under which the State stands as vendor to private purchasers on extremely easy instalments, and in which the State is landlord to private lessees, are both in operation at the present time in several parts of the British dominions. But it is believed that even New Zealand—the home of experimental legislation—has not yet ventured to put the State in the position of an under-lessee, between a private head-lessee and a private under-lessee.

Burial of the Dead at Sea.

A SINGULAR action appears to have been commenced in the American courts. Dr. CHALMERS PRENTICE, of Chicago, whose wife died on the North German liner *Königin Luise* and was buried at sea, against the wishes of her daughter, who accompanied her, seeks to recover substantial damages against the company. Mrs. PRENTICE died soon after the steamer left Gibraltar, and her body is alleged to have been buried at sea in spite of the protests of her daughter. We can find no authority for such an action in the English reports. It has indeed been laid down that there can be no property in the

dead body of a human being. *Prima facie* the executors are entitled to the possession, and are responsible for the burial, of a dead body, but we are strongly disposed to think that it would be held that this right is liable to be superseded by the act of the master of the ship, who, in the case of the death of a passenger, might, in the exercise of a reasonable discretion, direct the body to be buried at sea, as in the case of Sir DAVID WILKIE, the eminent artist, who died near Gibraltar on board the steamer *Oriental* in 1841. The duration of voyages has now been materially shortened, and it is possible that the owners of passenger steamers may think proper to support the enactment of regulations for the disposal of the bodies of those who die at sea.

Warranties Implied by the Law.

THE JUDGES of the present day, in their administration of the law of contract, shew much unwillingness to imply warranties or to import stipulations into bargains which, after full deliberation, have been made by the parties. It has been said with regard to warranties implied by law that the law itself must take care to keep them within the boundaries of reason and justice, so as not to impose impracticable obligations. There are, however, occasions where the law feels bound to conclude that a warranty of some description, founded on the presumed intention of the parties, must be imported into their contract. In the case of *Gardiner v. Gray* (4 Camp. 144), where a number of bags of waste silk had been sold in London for delivery in Manchester without referring to samples or specifying particularly the quality of the commodity, Lord ELLENBOROUGH held that the purchaser had a right to expect a saleable article answering the description in the contract, and that, without any particular warranty, this was an implied term in every such contract. In the vigorous language of the Chief Justice, the purchaser cannot be supposed to buy goods to lay them on a "dunghill." In a case which recently came before the judge of the City of London Court, the owner of working-class houses, who had employed a builder to do certain repairs, claimed damages for breach of contract, and gave evidence to shew that after the work was finished it was discovered that the roofs were not watertight. The defendant, by way of answer, offered to prove that the property was in a bad state, and that the roofs were watertight for at least five months. Roofs in London, in the case of poor property, could not be expected to last longer. The judge, after observing that he had once held that a watch ought to go at least until the purchaser had got out of the seller's shop, decided that a roof which was stated to have been made watertight ought to last at least twelve months, and gave judgment against the defendant.

Linked Chancery Judges.

THE HEARING of a motion for judgment in default of appearance in a case of *Ward v. Pickle*, on the 4th inst., was made the occasion by KEKEWICH, J., for a useful pronouncement on the proper practice to be followed in the Chancery Division as to stating the name of the judge before whom such a motion should be made. The writ had been marked, under ord. 5, r. 9a, with the name of JOYCE, J., but, inasmuch as by the current arrangement made between himself and KEKEWICH, J., his linked judge, under rule 9a of the same order, the non-witness work of the sittings was being taken by the latter judge, a notice of motion for judgment in default of appearance, marked as a short cause, and given as for hearing before JOYCE, J., came into the paper of KEKEWICH, J. A suggestion having been made in a former case, heard last sittings under similar circumstances, that the defendant might thus be misled into only watching the list of JOYCE, J., KEKEWICH, J., stated that he had consulted three of the other five judges of the Chancery Division, and that they agreed with him that such a contention on behalf of a defendant was untenable, if only because it was to be assumed that such a defendant was, or ought to be, sufficiently cognizant of the course of events and practice in the Chancery Division not to be so misled. There are thus, apparently, no less than four distinct ways in which a notice of motion for judgment in such a case could have been effectively given—namely, as before (1) Mr. Justice JOYCE; (2) Mr. Justice KEKEWICH; (3) Mr. Justice KEKEWICH for Mr. Justice JOYCE; or (4) Mr. Justice KEKEWICH

or Mr. Justice JOYCE. It is suggested that the last of these four alternatives, which was the form actually adopted in a similar case of *Pink v. Pink*, which was heard immediately after *Ward v. Pickle*, is the preferable and most instructive form, and it was approved by KEKEWICH, J., as avoiding all possible questions.

The Criminal Appeal Bill.

THE CRIMINAL Appeal Bill has been read a second time in the House of Commons after a debate almost entirely free from party bias, and of a far from uninteresting nature. Probably one of the most noteworthy features was the complaint of the Home Secretary as to the "almost unbearable" position of the occupant of his office in late years from the attacks of the less reputable newspapers in reference to convicted persons. We can all probably recall cases of late in which some one of these papers has taken up the case of a person said to have been wrongly convicted with such heat and violence, and with such utter absence of any real weighing of evidence, as to seriously embarrass proper inquiry into the circumstances. Such stuff is swallowed readily by a large number of ignorant persons, who directly and indirectly bring undue pressure to bear upon the Home Secretary, and probably make fierce attacks upon the unfortunate judge who tried the case. This state of things is undoubtedly a serious evil, and one which the creation of the proposed Court of Criminal Appeal ought to alter for the better. There can be little excuse for popular clamour after a conviction has been thoroughly examined and confirmed by the Court of Appeal; and while the appeal is still pending newspapers will have to beware of the law of contempt of court. There was almost complete agreement amongst the members who took part in the debate as to there being a right of appeal in all cases on questions of law, but there is still a certain amount of objection to allowing appeals on questions of fact. It may be pointed out, however, that in most of the cases of alleged wrongful conviction which have created great public interest an appeal on questions of law only would not have met the case. It is on the facts that the agitation proceeds, and it is a reversal of the decision of fact which is aimed at.

The Necessary Increase of Judges.

ALL THROUGH the debate there ran the fear that the creation of the new court will cause a block in legal business. This fear is undoubtedly well founded, for it is absolutely certain that there will be a very large number of criminal appeals, and that the hearing of them will occupy a great deal of judicial time. The remedy, however, is in the hands of the Government, and no doubt the strong committee which has just been appointed to inquire into the whole state of judicial business will suggest a way of dealing with the difficulty. But in face of the present congestion of business, and the large amount of additional business to be created by the Bill, it is impossible to conceive of any plan for bettering the present state of things which does not involve the appointment of additional judges. However, if the Bill is a good one, as the majority of persons capable of judging think it is, it will have to be paid for; and the Attorney-General made it plain that, as far as the Government are concerned, they are ready to pay. Nothing is more certain than that the change in the law will be an unmixed evil if the new court fails to work quickly and to deal with appeals practically as they arise. The bogey that the sense of responsibility of jurors will disappear when they know that their verdict may be revised made its inevitable appearance. It is a suggestion which it is difficult to deal with except by a mere denial. Where reputation is at stake in a civil case there is no sign that the sense of responsibility of jurors is any less than it is in criminal cases, and we can see no ground whatever for the suggestion. We do see great force, however, in the suggestion that the Bill will have the effect of improving the proceedings of courts of quarter sessions, and increasing the sense of responsibility of their chairmen. Chairmen will, no doubt, be much more careful in weighing their sentences, and in summing up their cases, when they know that there is a court above them which may sit in judgment

upon every step they take. The Bill passed without a division; and as it is one of the measures which the Prime Minister has announced is to be proceeded with this session, it looks as if this would be the last of the long series of Bills which have been introduced with a similar object.

Personal Luggage.

MANY DISPUTES between railway companies and passengers have been brought into court as to what is "personal luggage," but it has never been doubted that articles of clothing, articles intended to be actually worn, toilet articles and such like, come under the description. Such things, as a rule, must be carried by railway companies without extra charge, up to a certain weight, when accompanying a passenger on a journey. It has always been assumed, however, that the Carriers Act, 1830, applies to personal luggage as to other goods; and that if sealskin jackets, or valuable silk dresses, or silver-backed hair brushes, exceeding £10 in value, are lost when being carried in passengers' luggage, the company are protected by the Act, and are not liable for the loss unless the nature and value of the goods have been declared. No doubt appears to have ever been cast upon this statement of the law until the case of *Cancell v. The Cheshire Lines Committee* was argued in a King's Bench Divisional Court this week. The plaintiff lost a box which was being carried in the ordinary way as passenger's luggage. In this box were goods of the description mentioned in the Carriers Act to the value of £20, and other goods to the value of about £30. In an action in a county court the plaintiff recovered judgment for the full value of his lost property. Against this judgment, so far as the goods coming under the Carriers Act were concerned, the defendants appealed. In support of the judgment it was argued that the Carriers Act does not apply to goods which come under the description of ordinary personal luggage. It was contended that, as passengers are entitled to have a certain weight of luggage carried free, and that in the company's time-tables (which formed part of the contract) it was stated that a certain weight of personal luggage might be carried free, there was a special contract which precluded the company from making any charge for any goods properly described as personal luggage, and that the special contract took the case out of the Act. This is certainly a very ingenious argument, and one which can by no means be treated with contempt; but the court were right, it is submitted, in rejecting it. In the first place, section 1 of the Carriers Act expressly provides that the Act shall apply to goods of the kinds mentioned delivered to the carrier "either to be carried for hire or to accompany the person of any passenger." Unless, therefore, the contract of the passenger excludes the operation of the Act, the Act appears to expressly deal with personal luggage carried without extra charge. The contract of the passenger, however, does not seem to have anything to do with the extent of the liability of the carrier; it is merely concerned with the duty of the carrier to carry a certain weight of luggage without extra charge. The contract is absolutely consistent with the right of the company to insist upon a declaration of the nature of the goods and a payment by way of insurance as provided by the Act, although they would probably not be justified in making any charge for the actual carriage. In other words, the company is bound to carry all things properly called personal luggage up to the allowed weight, but are entitled to the protection of the Act. The same argument applies to the provisions of the various private Acts of the companies requiring them to carry personal luggage without extra charge. There is nothing in any of those Acts inconsistent with the continued protection of the Carriers Act. In fact, the decision of the county court judge seems to be directly contrary to the decision of the Court of Exchequer in *Flowers v. South-Eastern Railway* (16 L. T. 329), which appears to have settled the point, and which has been up to now unchallenged.

The Scottish Law of Slander.

THE INHABITANTS of Scotland are by many persons supposed to be more hard-headed and practical than their English neighbours, and it is therefore matter for surprise that their law

should pay more regard to a shock to the feelings than is tolerated by the English authorities. The father of a child whose death has been caused by the negligence of a third person is without remedy in England, but the Scottish courts allow him to bring an action to recover damages for the sorrow and anguish which he has sustained. A letter containing libellous expressions against anyone and delivered to him, although it may not have been shewn to any third party, is actionable by the law of Scotland to the extent at least of recovering damages for the injury done to the feelings. In this respect the Scottish law differs from that of England, in which it is held that the delivery of a letter into the plaintiff's own hands does not afford sufficient proof of publication to maintain an action for damages, though an indictment or information may be sustained in such a case, the letter being considered only as a misdemeanour and a provocation to a challenge and breach of the peace. A case which recently came before the Court of Session in Scotland, upon appeal from the Sheriff Court at Peterhead, is a rather curious example of the Scottish law in this respect. The plaintiff, a chemist and druggist, brought his action against the defendant, a medical practitioner, for slander contained in a letter. It appeared that when the defendant began practice in the country town to which he and the plaintiff belonged, he found it to be expedient to adopt the prevailing custom, and to employ a special chemist who knew the meaning of the terms used in his prescriptions. If a prescription of another doctor was brought to a chemist, and he was in doubt as to a term, it was usual for him to inquire of the doctor's particular chemist. The plaintiff, who was not the defendant's chemist, having received a prescription of the defendant, inserted in the mixture a different compound of a drug from that intended. The mistake arose from the fact that the terms in the prescription were applicable to different compounds. The defendant, having heard of what had occurred, communicated by telephone with the plaintiff, and not receiving as he considered a courteous reply, he wrote a letter to him in the evening of the same day threatening, unless he received as apology, to put the matter in the hands of the police. The Court of Session held that the letter was written on a privileged occasion, inasmuch as the defendant had a right, if not a duty, to inquire into the matter, for it was a serious thing for a chemist to dispense a drug which was not in accordance with the prescription of the physician. But the defendant, after he had had the greater part of a day to think over the matter, had in the letter used expressions which went beyond anything which was warranted by the occasion. Malice might, therefore, be inferred, and they made a decree for damages against the defendant. Apart from the question of non-publication, an English court would probably accept the reasoning adopted by the Court of Session.

Quack Doctors and the Law.

A JUDGMENT recently delivered by the Supreme Court of Vienna has decided that a person who has held himself out as competent to give medical advice, or to undertake the medical treatment of a patient, without being in possession of proper qualifications, is liable to penalties prescribed by the law. If it be proved that he has on more than one occasion received payment for his medical work, he is liable to be convicted as a quack and to undergo a heavier punishment. The English law is much more indulgent to the unqualified practitioner, and a correspondent of the *Medical Press and Circular* takes occasion to contrast the attitude of the State towards the professions of law and medicine respectively. He refers to a report in one of the newspapers by which it appeared that a qualified solicitor was summoned before a London police magistrate on the charge of "wilfully and falsely pretending to be a solicitor." The defendant was in fact fully qualified, and had been on the rolls for many years, but his certificate had been refused in the previous year in consequence of his being an undischarged bankrupt. There had been no false representation on his part; he was acting for an old unfortunate client. He was, nevertheless, fined £5 and costs, or imprisonment in default of distress. This case, he says, may be contrasted with what is allowed to go on under medical law. A medical practitioner, having been convicted of criminal practices, was

struck off the medical register, and immediately after his release from prison recommenced practice with the title of "Dr.," and remained unmolested until he was guilty of an offence similar to that for which he had already been punished. Advertisements of cures for hopeless cases of cancer or consumption are common enough, and are apparently beyond the reach of the law. It was said by an eminent French author that quacks are more dangerous to mankind than vultures, for the latter devour only the dead, while the former prey upon the living. But the English law has so far made few, if any, attempts to interfere with the proceedings of the professors of quack medicine.

Liability of a Lodger for Accidents to His Landlady

AN ESTEEMED correspondent raises in another column, with becoming gravity, the question whether, under the new Workmen's Compensation Act, a lodger or paying guest will be liable for accidents to his landlady or host? We presume that his query is suggested by the exemption from the Act of "a member of the employer's family dwelling in his house" and by the wide definition in the Act of "workman" as meaning "any person who has entered into or works under a contract of service with an employer, whether by way of manual labour, or otherwise, and whether the contract is expressed or implied, is oral or in writing." But does a landlady or host enter into, or work under, a "contract of service" with the lodger or paying guest as her employer? It would be provocative of dire indignation if a lodger were to suggest to his landlady that she, as his servant, is bound to obey his orders—for instance, as to the slaughter of the lodging-house cat, which performs such surprising feats in the way of consumption of food and damage to the lodger's chattels. The landlady is, so far as we can see, no more the servant of the lodger than an hotel keeper is the servant of his guests. The contract in each case is merely to provide lodging and board for the guest. The landlady is not by any means a person "*inops consilii*," so as, according to COLLINS, M.R., in *Simpson v. Ebbw Vale Steel Co.* (1905, 1 K. B. 453), to be within the class intended to be benefited by the Act; she is usually particularly well able to take care of her interests, and she and her cat between them generally manage to get the better of the lodger. We are not at all sure, indeed, whether our correspondent's query ought not to be turned upside down, so as to run: Is the landlady liable for accidents to her lodger, who has entered into an implied contract of service with her, in the sense of being bound to obey her orders and to provide sufficient food from time to time for her and the cat aforesaid?

Stealing the Goods of a Person Unknown.

IN AN article in the *Cornhill Magazine* for June, with the title "Wanted, More Knowledge," the writer gives some account of his searches in the records of the Sussex Quarter Sessions in the middle of the seventeenth century, and says that there is much that one would give anything to know; and, with regard to the convictions for theft, asks: "How could one steal, as EDWARD GILBERT was alleged to have stolen, two beehives, value eightpence, from a person unknown? How could SIMON YOUNG, ANNE his wife, THOMAS YOUNG and MARY his wife manage to steal 'nine shillings and tuppence' from a person unknown? Or, rather, how could they be convicted of the same? Did they confess, when the 'nine and tuppence' had burned a hole in their quadrilateral conscience? Or was the person unknown someone whose name the justices wished to conceal? I was always vainly hoping to meet an assault and battery upon a person unknown." It is possible that these queries are written by one who is familiar with the law, and can find matter for jest in its phraseology, for it is common knowledge that if the name of the party injured be unknown to the prosecutor, as in the case of the murder of a stranger, or larceny from the person of a stranger who does not come forward to prosecute, he may be described in the indictment as a person unknown, and a man may be indicted for the murder of, or for stealing the goods of, "a certain person to the jurors unknown." In the case of certain persons who were convicted and executed near Hindhead, in Surrey, at the close of the eighteenth century for the murder of a young sailor, the name of this unfortunate person could never be discovered, and the murderers were convicted on the evidence of those who had observed them and their conversation at an alehouse.

The Law and Practice of Duelling.

IT is curious to observe how the practice of duelling still lingers long after it has been prohibited and made punishable by the criminal law. Duelling was not unknown in England during the last century, as appears in the novels of DICKENS and THACKERAY, but if a fatal duel took place when the parties were in cool blood it was held to be murder, though juries occasionally gave a verdict of acquittal in cases where they sympathized with the prisoner. In France it is established by decisions of the Court of Cassation that the articles of the Code which relate to murder are applicable to homicide committed in a duel. This being the law, one may feel some surprise in reading a notice on the subject of duelling which M. PICQUART, the Minister of War, has quite recently addressed to the commanders of the different army corps. In this notice M. PICQUART states that the Government decline to lay down any regulations respecting duels in which officers of the army are concerned. These duels will not in future be considered as matters of public interest, but will be left to be arranged by the parties according to their views of honour and propriety. This notice is possibly a step towards the extinction of the practice of duelling, though it may seem at first sight to amount to a recognition by the Government of encounters which are a breach of the public peace and subject to the punishments for offences against life and limb.

Setting Aside Chamber Orders in Chancery.

THE decision of KEKEWICH, J., in *Harrington v. Ramage* which we reported last week (*ante*, p. 514) has created considerable uncertainty as to the proper practice to be adopted in order to vary or discharge an order made in Chancery Chambers.

Since the year 1884 the practice has hitherto been clear. In that year PEARSON, J., made a statement in court as to what then was, and was to continue to be, the settled practice of the Chancery Division in this respect (see Practice Note, W. N. (1884), 218; cited 1 Ann. Prac., 1907, p. 760). It can hardly be supposed that PEARSON, J., made the statement referred to without consultation with the other judges of the division, for the practice there laid down has been followed ever since in the Chambers of all the Chancery judges. The statement referred to is as follows: "An adjournment to the judge will not be granted unless an application is made to the chief clerk (now Master) at the time when the summons is heard by him either for an adjournment or for time to consider whether an adjournment shall be asked for. If no application is made to the chief clerk (Master) at the time, the order can only be altered by means of a motion in court to discharge it. If an order is made against a party properly served in his absence, the result is the same as if, being present, he does not ask for an adjournment."

In *Harrington v. Ramage* (*ante*, p. 514) the Master made an order to stay an action as frivolous and vexatious. The plaintiff's solicitor made no application for adjournment to the judge, nor did he apply for time to consider whether he should do so. In fact, he declined to do so. The plaintiff in the action then changed his solicitor, and the new plaintiff's solicitor applied promptly to the Master to reinstate the case in his list in order to enable him to obtain an adjournment to the judge. This course, however, was not in accordance with the established practice as laid down in the above statement by PEARSON, J., and the defendant objected to the matter being re-opened. As no application for adjournment had been made to the Master when the order was made, it could only be varied or discharged by means of a motion in court to discharge it. The plaintiff, therefore, appears to have been following the established practice in moving the court for the discharge of the order. KEKEWICH, J., however, said that "any motion of this kind to discharge the Master's order is wholly irregular, and will be discharged." This will come as a surprise to legal practitioners.

The circumstances of the case were peculiar. The newly-

appointed solicitor for the plaintiff could not get an adjournment to the judge for the reason above explained. His only course appears to have been to move the judge in court to discharge the judge's order made in chambers. We say "judge's order" advisedly, because there is no such thing as a Master's order in Chancery. Every order made in Chancery chambers is the order of the judge. The parties either accept it as such from the Master, or, if either of them desires to question it, he can demand as of right that it be adjourned to the judge for his personal consideration. Where neither party makes such a demand at the time, the ruling of PEARSON, J., in 1884—which in such an event enables the order to be discharged on motion—comes into operation. This is a species of saving clause, designed, no doubt, to avoid the door being closed prematurely against an application to discharge a chamber order where the circumstances of a case are such that the ordinary procedure of adjournment to the judge in chambers, and subsequent motion in court to discharge his order, cannot be conveniently applied.

We venture to express the hope that the doubt raised by the decision in *Harrington v. Ramage* will be removed by some authoritative statement of practice applicable to all the Chambers of the Chancery Division. We confess to a decided preference for the old rule of practice as stated by PEARSON, J., which enables a solicitor against whose client an order is made by a Master in Chambers, and who does not at the time express any desire to go to the judge, to subsequently reconsider his position, and, if he is so advised, to apply by motion to discharge the order.

The more stringent procedure laid down by KEKEWICH, J., would probably tend to increase the number of adjournments before the Master for the purpose of allowing the unsuccessful party time to consider whether he should demand an adjournment to the judge, otherwise the only chance of objecting to the order would be lost. If the possibility of obtaining a variation of the order made by the Master were to be strictly limited to cases where the solicitor claimed at the time, or reserved his right to claim, an adjournment to the judge, the responsibility of the solicitor in allowing an order to pass unchallenged would be materially increased. The adjournment to the judge is not an appeal, but it is in the nature of an appeal, and there is no instance in our procedure in which the right to appeal is made to depend entirely on the decision of a moment. If the ruling of KEKEWICH, J., is adopted, a time will have to be fixed within which a party to any application in Chancery chambers may claim an adjournment to the judge. But this would have the unfortunate effect of delaying the drawing up of every Chamber order until the expiration of the period fixed, for, as we have said, adjournment to the judge is not an appeal against an order made, but is the suspension of a proposed order by the Master until the judge has personally considered it.

Ademption of Legacies by External Interference.

THE Court of Appeal have affirmed (1907, 1 Ch. 665) the decision of JOYCE, J., in *Re Slater* (1906, 2 Ch. 480), and have arrived at a result which, technically, no doubt, is correct, but as to which, practically, the same confidence cannot be felt. A testator by his will, dated in February, 1904, bequeathed to a legatee the interest during her life arising from money invested in certain specified securities, including money invested in the Lambeth Waterworks Co. At that date the testator had £1,075 Lambeth Waterworks £10 per cent. Stock. He died in May, 1905, and had there been no interference from outside the legatee would clearly have been entitled to receive for her life the income from the stock. But prior to the date of the will the Lambeth Waterworks Co.'s dissolution had been arranged by Act of Parliament; and after that date, but before the testator's death, this dissolution had taken effect and the stock had ceased to exist and had been replaced by Metropolitan Water Stock. This was under the Metropolitan Water Act, 1902, which provided that, as from the 24th of June, 1904, the under-

taking of each of the Metropolitan water companies (including the Lambeth Waterworks Co.) should be transferred to the Metropolitan Water Board, and that the board should pay to each company as compensation a sum to be determined, in default of agreement, by arbitration, but that the sum so payable might, if the Water Board and the company so agreed, be discharged wholly or partly in water stock. In August, 1904, the directors of the Lambeth Waterworks Co. prepared a scheme for the application and distribution of the compensation awarded to the company, which was taken in water stock, and under the scheme there was issued to the testator in respect of his holding the sum of £3,739 13s. 2d. Metropolitan Water B Stock. This was the stock which he held at his death in lieu of his Lambeth Waterworks Stock, and the legatee naturally supposed that the testator's intentions would be carried out by giving her the income of it. But in this both JOYCE, J., and the Court of Appeal have disappointed her.

The technical justification of this decision has been put on two grounds—first, that since the will is, under section 24 of the Wills Act, 1837, to be taken as speaking from the testator's death, there was then no Lambeth Waterworks Stock upon which it could operate, and consequently that the gift failed to take effect; and, secondly, that if the gift was treated as a gift of the income of the specific stock which the testator had at the date of the will, yet the legacy had been, in the circumstances, adeemed. JOYCE, J., decided the case upon the first ground only. Section 24, it will be remembered, runs: "Every will shall be construed, with reference to the real and personal estate comprised in it, to speak and take effect as if it had been executed immediately before the death of the testator, unless a contrary intention shall appear by the will." In *Goodlad v. Burnett* (1 K. & J. 341) Wood, V.C., held that no such contrary intention could be inferred from the mere fact that a testator spoke of "my" stock, and hence a gift by a testatrix of all her Three-and-a-quarter per cent. Annuities passed all such stock as she had at the time of her death. In that case the decision operated very much in favour of the legatee. At the date of the will the amount of the stock was £3,010; at the death it was £17,010. Similarly JOYCE, J., held that there was no "contrary intention" in the will in *Re Slater* to prevent the gift operating only on such Lambeth Waterworks Stock as the testator had at the time of his death. "As a matter of construction, and construction merely, this bequest, in my opinion, passed so much and no more money than the testator had at his death invested in the Lambeth Waterworks Co. The Metropolitan Water B Stock, therefore, did not pass."

With this view both COZENS-HARDY, M.R., and BARNES, P., agreed, but they were also of opinion that, even if the gift could be referred to the Lambeth Waterworks Stock held by the testator at the date of his will, yet it had been adeemed by the subsequent conversion into Metropolitan Water Stock. It has, indeed, been recognized that a mere change in the denomination of stock after the date of a will, without any substantial change in the owner's rights, does not operate as an ademption. In *Oakes v. Oakes* (9 Hare 666) a testator bequeathed all his Great Western Railway shares in terms which referred to the shares held by him at the date of his will. These were subsequently converted into consolidated stock, and it was held that the bequest operated on the stock. The investment, TURNER, V.C., pointed out, existed substantially in the same state as at the date of the will. Moreover, the change had been effected quite independently of the testator, hence the case is distinguishable from *Re Lane* (14 Ch. D. 856), where a testator, under an option conferred upon him, took debenture stock in substitution for debentures, and it was held that a bequest of all his debentures did not include the debenture stock. But in *Re Slater* the Master of the Rolls declined to apply the principle of *Oakes v. Oakes* to the case of a change of investment from Lambeth Waterworks Stock to Metropolitan Water Stock. The principle of that case, he pointed out, required that the old and the new investment should be substantially the same thing. In *Re Slater*, however, an investment in a company restricted to part of the metropolitan area, and conferring particular rights, had been changed to an investment in a public authority covering the entire area which conferred essentially different rights.

Consequently, if the legacy related to the Lambeth Waterworks Stock held by the testator at the date of his will, this had disappeared before his death, and there was nothing which could be treated as identical with it. The fact that the change had been made without any intervention on the part of the testator was treated, it would seem, as immaterial. The subject-matter of the legacy had gone, and with it the legacy.

With the view taken by the Master of the Rolls and the President KENNEDY, L.J., expressed a somewhat guarded concurrence, and, so far as the case rested upon the doctrine of ademption, he intimated his dissent. The practical incorrectness of the decision rests upon the operation of section 24 of the Wills Act in a case where an external authority intervenes between the date of the will and the date of the testator's death, and substitutes a new investment for an investment mentioned in the will. This means that the testator must forthwith make an alteration in his will so as to meet the altered circumstances—a precaution which may well be overlooked—or that the legatee must be disappointed in consequence of the external interference. Apparently the result in the present case must be accepted as one of the hardships which occasionally occur in applying any hard and fast rules to the division of property. Apart from the Wills Act and the doctrine of ademption, there can be little doubt that the bequest ought to have operated on the water stock; in other words, the statute and the force of circumstances defeated the testator's intention and disappointed the legatee.

The Conveyancing and Settled Land Bills.

II.

WE noticed last week the provisions of the Conveyancing Bill which has been prepared on instructions of the Council of the Law Society and introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. MICKLEM. It remains to state the provisions of the two companion Bills—the Settled Land Bill and the Married Women's Property Bill.

In substance the Settled Land Bill is the same as that of last year, though it has been considerably altered in details and arrangement, and some additional clauses have been introduced. As is well known, considerable difficulties have been experienced in applying the Settled Land Acts to the varying circumstances which arise when property which has been once settled becomes subject to resettlement before all the purposes of the original settlement have been exhausted. With a view to preserving intact the statutory powers of the tenant for life, it was enacted by section 50 of the Act of 1882 that those powers should not be capable of assignment or release, and should remain exercisable by the tenant for life notwithstanding any assignment of his estate. From this provision, as interpreted in *Re Lord Wimborne and Browne* (1904, 1 Ch. 537), it follows that even a surrender by a tenant for life of his life estate to the next tenant for life under the settlement does not affect the powers of the surrenderor. He has, it is pointed out in the prefatory note to the Bill, parted with his entire interest in the land, and the next tenant for life has gone into possession; but the latter, though in fact tenant for life, has no power under the Acts till the death of the surrenderor. Clause 2 proposes to rectify this by providing that, where the estate of a tenant for life is surrendered to the person next entitled in remainder, and the surrenderee is a person who, if the surrenderor were dead, would have the statutory powers of a tenant for life, the statutory powers of the surrenderor shall, notwithstanding section 50, cease to be exercisable by him.

Clause 3 deals with the case where a settlement has been exhausted except as to the existence of charges or a power of charging. It was held in *Re Mundy and Roper's Contract* (1899, 1 Ch. 275), following *Re Marquis of Ailesbury and Lord Iveagh* (1893, 2 Ch. 345), that an estate is limited to, or in trust for, persons in succession, so as to be settled land within the meaning of the Acts, when it is subject to jointure rent-charges and portions, as well as when there are limitations of successive freehold estates; and clause 3 proposes to confirm this by enacting that land which has at any time been settled land under a settlement shall be deemed, for the purposes of the Settled Land Acts, to remain settled land so long as any charge or power of charging under the settlement subsists or is capable of being exercised. Clause 3 also provides that the trustees of a settlement within that clause for the purposes of the Acts shall remain the trustees thereof for those purposes so long as the land is deemed to be settled land.

The general question of who are to be regarded as the trustees for the purposes of the Acts of a compound settlement is dealt with in

clause 4. In the ordinary case land is first settled by settlement A to X. for life, with powers of jointuring and charging, with remainders in tail over. In due course X. joins with the next remainderman in tail to resettle the estate by settlement B, and in the meantime there may have been deeds creating a jointure rent-charge and portions charges, with terms to secure them. Under settlement B, X. will take a life estate, which, of course, is a different estate from that which he had under settlement A, and which is gone. But if there were any powers incident to his estate under settlement A which are not exhausted, and which it is desired to preserve, then his life estate under settlement B is expressed to be in restoration of his previous life estate. This does not mean that his previous life estate is in fact restored, which would be impossible, but that the powers which were incident to it are to continue to be exercisable, and it is possible that for this purpose it has a fictitious existence. Moreover, as stated above, the statutory powers of X., as former tenant for life, continue to be exercisable under settlement A, notwithstanding the resettlement, so long as any charges created under settlement A are in existence. Accordingly, as was seen in *Re Mundy and Roper's Contract* (*supra*), X. can sell either as a person having the powers of a tenant for life under settlement A, or, with the consent of the jointress and charge owners, as tenant for life under settlement B; and there must be trustees for the purposes of the Settled Land Acts of the settlement under which he sells. In general, therefore, trustees of the compound settlement created by the series of deeds are unnecessary, though, as in *Re Mundy and Roper's Contract* (*supra*), they have been frequently appointed. They are required, however, where, as in *Re Marquis of Ailesbury and Lord Iveagh* (*supra*), there are charges subsisting under deeds prior to the settlement from which the vendor tenant for life derives his powers.

As is well known, difficulty has arisen in applying the above principles by reason of the decision of FARWELL, J., in *Re Cornwallis-West and Munro's Contract* (1903, 2 Ch. 150), a difficulty which is not removed by the explanation of that decision given in *Re Lord Wimborne and Browne's* (*supra*). The decision rests upon the notion that, if settlement B purports to restore X.'s life estate under settlement A, he takes no life estate under settlement B to which the statutory powers are attached. This appears to ignore the actual estate for life created by settlement B, and to ascribe to the conveyancing device of the restoration of the former estate greater efficacy than it can on principle have. Clause 4 proposes to meet the various questions thus arising by providing, first, that as long as any charge or power of charging subsists, or is capable of being exercised, under settlement A, the trustees of that settlement for the purposes of the Acts shall be trustees of the compound settlement, consisting of that and any subsequent instruments. In general, as already pointed out, it is sufficient that they are trustees of settlement A, but this provision would make unnecessary any application to appoint trustees of the compound settlement. Then sub-clause 2 proposes to overrule *Re Cornwallis-West and Munro's Contract* (*supra*), and to provide that, where settlement B purports to restore the life estate of X. under settlement A, this shall not prevent him from exercising his powers under settlement B in addition to his powers under settlement A or under the compound settlement.

Another class of compound settlement occurs when there is an existing settlement of estate P, and estate Q is settled by reference to the trusts of that existing settlement. In *Re Coull's Settled Estates* (1905, 1 Ch. 712) it was decided that in such a case, in order to deal with estate Q, trustees ought to be appointed of the compound settlement, consisting of the two settlements; but it should be sufficient that there are existing trustees of the settlement to which reference is made, and sub-section 3 of clause 4 proposes to enact accordingly. The case of different estates being subject to the same limitations is further dealt with in clause 12, and it is proposed, in accordance with *Re Mundy's Settled Estates* (1891, 1 Ch. 399) and other cases, to enact that the several estates may be treated as one aggregate estate. Where the trustees of the several settlements are the same persons, they will be trustees of the aggregate estate; where they are different persons, the statutory notices must be given to the trustees of every settlement which comprises any part of the land proposed to be dealt with. But where the capital money arises from the sale of land in more than one settlement it may, by direction of the tenant for life, be paid wholly to the trustees of one settlement, or apportioned between the settlements as he thinks fit.

The above questions as to compound settlements are the most important dealt with by the Settled Land Bill, but there are numerous clauses removing difficulties which have been experienced in the working of the Acts. Thus clause 7 extends the class of persons by whom the powers of a tenant for life are exercisable to persons entitled in fee subject to settlement charges. Clause 11, in the case where there is no person who has the powers of a tenant for life, confers these upon the trustees of the settlement. Clause 13 confers, in manner which has been approved by Sir JAMES STIRLING, the powers of a tenant for life upon the trustees for sale within

section 63 of the Act of 1882. And clause 21 enables trustees to act with greater safety in following the directions of the tenant for life as to the investment of capital money. The intermediate clauses propose in various ways to increase the powers of tenants for life, and to facilitate the management of lands during minority.

The Married Women's Property Bill consists of three clauses only. Clause 1 proposes to get rid of *Re Harkness and Allsopp's Contract* (1896, 2 Ch. 358), and to enable a married woman trustee to convey the trust estate as a *feme sole*. This removes an obvious defect in the law due entirely to a technical construction placed upon the Act of 1882. Clause 2 will deprive a husband of the power, which section 19 of the Act of 1882 has incidentally left to him, of making a settlement of his wife's property which will be binding upon her without her consent: see *Stevens v. Trevor-Garrick* (1893, 2 Ch. 307). It proposes that, notwithstanding section 19, a settlement made by the husband respecting the wife's property shall not be valid unless executed by her, if she is of full age, or confirmed by her after she attains full age. And clause 3 removes a doubt whether a married woman can alone be protector of a settlement in respect of a life estate which is her statutory separate property. As we have already observed, the three Bills are all intended to remove admitted conveyancing difficulties, and it is to be hoped that they may secure a passage through Parliament.

Reviews.

The Law of Salvage.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF CIVIL SALVAGE. By the Right Hon. Lord Justice KENNEDY. SECOND EDITION. By A. R. KENNEDY, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The law of salvage plays a very important part in the business of shipowners and of the Admiralty Division. A salvage award is one of the possibilities which may atone in some measure to the shipowner for a prolonged period of low freights, while the risk of having to pay salvage is a matter which he can cover by insurance. In the Admiralty Division salvage claims not only furnish a considerable part of the business, but they are singular in the wide discretion which necessarily exists as to the amount of the award. This is not from any lack of considerations by which the amount should be determined. The number of these, as tabulated on p. 133, is considerable, but they leave the actual value of the salvage service so much at large that the award must always, as Lord Stowell said, be more or less "rusticum iudicium." The whole subject is explained in the present work in a manner at once lucid and interesting. The first chapter treats of salvage generally, and of the salvor's remedies, with a discussion of the mode by which the procedure *in rem arore*. The ingredients in salvage service form the subject of the second chapter, and subsequent chapters deal with the salvage reward, its apportionment, salvage agreements, and other matters. The chapter on the amount of the award emphasizes the favour with which the courts regard steamship services, in particular the services of special salvage ships. Steam has materially lessened the time of salvage operations, but has not thereby lessened the claim to reward. "I am at a loss to conceive," said Dr. Lushington in a case quoted at p. 150, where the short space of time occupied was urged in support of a small tender, "why a patient should complain of the shortness of an operation." An interesting chapter is devoted to salvage agreements, a species of contract which is peculiarly liable to be set aside if inequitable. Upon this *The Medina* (2 P. D. 5), where a captain stranded in the Red Sea with a cargo of pilgrims was bound to consent to £4,000 salvage money or leave them to drown, is a leading authority. The amount was reduced to £1,800. A list of modern salvage awards for towing disabled vessels—a form of salvage now very frequent—is given in an appendix.

Correspondence.

The Workmen's Compensation Act.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—Can you or any reader say whether the Act is considered as imposing a liability on lodgers or paying guests (whether of working classes or others) for accidents to the landlady, and whether the question of liability would depend in any way on the landlady having a husband, or being assisted by a domestic servant, or by the lodger paying a fixed sum for apartments and attendance, and extra for food, or a fixed sum for residence and board as part of the family?

X. Y. Z.

[See observations under the head of "Current Topics."—ED. S.J.]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

House of Lords.

GRIMSHAW'S DIVORCE (VALIDATION) BILL. 30th May.

IRELAND—DIVORCE—DECREE NISI UNDER THE ENGLISH DIVORCE ACTS—DOUBT AS TO VALIDITY OF DECREE—DOMICIL.

Where there are doubts as to the operation in Ireland, or elsewhere out of Ireland, of a decree under the English Divorce Acts for the dissolution of the marriage of a domiciled Irishman, the proper course is to apply for an Act of Parliament confirming the decree and removing all doubts.

This was a Bill presented by William Howard Murphy Grimshaw "to remove doubts as to the validity of a certain decree, dated the 30th of October, 1893, of the High Court of Justice (Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division) dissolving the marriage solemnized on the 16th of November, 1880, between the petitioner and Mary Evalina Julia Woodward, spinster, and to confirm the said decree." The petitioner was married to Miss Woodward at the British Embassy in Paris according to the rites of the Church of England. The petitioner had a life interest in large estates in Ireland, and there the parties went to reside until 1885, when the house and estates were let, and they came to live in London. In 1892 the petitioner instituted divorce proceedings against his wife. The suit was undefended, and on the 30th of October, 1893, the decree nisi was made absolute. The petitioner shortly afterwards married again, and the respondent married the co-respondent. No doubt as to the validity of that decree was suggested, as the jurisdiction of the English court to pronounce it appeared to be settled by *Niboyat v. Niboyat* (1878, 4 P. D. 1), which decided that the court had jurisdiction to grant a decree against a foreigner. In 1895, however, the Judicial Committee decided in *Le Mesurier v. Le Mesurier and Others* (1905, A. C. 517) that the courts of Ceylon had no jurisdiction to dissolve a marriage between British spouses resident in that island, and laid down the rule that the jurisdiction in divorce depended upon domicile. It was certainly doubtful if Mr. Murphy Grimshaw had lost his Irish and acquired an English domicile, and therefore a doubt as to the validity of the decree arose. When this was brought to Mr. Murphy Grimshaw's notice he at once took the necessary step to obtain a confirmation of the decree. In *Malone's case* (1905, A. C. 314) it was decided that where a doubt existed as to the validity of a decree the proper course was to obtain an Act of Parliament confirming the decree and removing doubts. Evidence was then given by the petitioner and three other witnesses in support of the petition, which was not opposed.

Lord LOREBURN, C., said he thought that a reasonable case why the Bill should be read a second time had been shown by the petitioner.

THE HOUSE (Lords ASHBORNE, MACNAGHTEN, JAMES OF HEREFORD, ROBERTSON, ATKINSON, and COLLINS) accepted the motion. The Bill was then read a second time.—COUNSEL, T. C. C. TUDIN. SOLICITORS, Trower, Still, Freeing, & Parkin.

[Reported by HASKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

GUARDIANS OF THE FULHAM UNION v. GUARDIANS OF THE WOOLWICH UNION. 22nd and 23rd April; 4th June.

POOR LAW—SETTLEMENT AND REMOVAL—RESIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT—CHILD UNDER SIXTEEN—ILLEGITIMATE CHILD OF MARRIED WOMAN—POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1834 (4 & 5 WILL. 4, c. 76), s. 71—POOR REMOVAL ACT, 1846 (9 & 10 VICT. c. 66), ss. 1, 3—POOR REMOVAL ACT, 1848 (11 & 12 VICT. c. 111), s. 1—DIVIDED PARISHES AND POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1876 (39 & 40 VICT. c. 61), ss. 34, 35.

An illegitimate child under sixteen can, under section 34 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, acquire a settlement of its own by residence with its mother, notwithstanding that the mother is throughout such residence precluded from acquiring a status of irremovability by the proviso to section 1 of the Poor Removal Act, 1846, contained in section 1 of the Poor Removal Act, 1848. And a settlement so acquired by an illegitimate child takes effect at once, and not only after the child attains the age of sixteen. That proviso does not apply to an illegitimate child, and, therefore, does not prevent an illegitimate child from acquiring an independent status of irremovability under the first part of section 1 of the Act of 1846. And the expression "person" in section 1 of the Act of 1846 and in section 34 of the Act of 1876 includes a child under sixteen.

Per Lord LOREBURN, C.—There is no ground for the argument that the effect of section 3 of the Act of 1846 is qualified by the Act of 1848.

Seemingly, that a child whose removal from the parish in which it resides is not precluded by section 3 of the Poor Removal Act, 1846, but who is not otherwise irremovable, does fulfil the conditions of section 34 of the Act of 1876 as to residence under such circumstances as would render it irremovable, and that such residence, whether with the father or reputed father or with the mother, if either of the parents had acquired an irremovable settlement, therefore confers on the child a settlement.

Appeal from the decision of the Court of Appeal reversing that of the Divisional Court. The decision of the Court of Appeal is reported 1906, 2 K. B. 240, and that of the Divisional Court in 1905, 2 K. B. 203. The question had reference to the settlement of the five illegitimate children of a married woman named Rosa Turpin. The Court of Appeal had assigned them to the parish of Fulham, in which the mother and the reputed father had lived, but the appellants contended that they should be assigned to that of their mother's husband, which was in the respondent's union, on the ground that the mother was not a deserted woman and had never lost her husband's settlement, and that the children retained the settlement of their mother. *Our adv. cult.*

Lord LOREBURN, C., in moving that the appeal should be dismissed, said the question here was whether illegitimate children under sixteen were to be regarded as settled in Woolwich Union or in Fulham Union. They were the children of Rosa Turpin, a married woman, who had left her husband, and had for some years been living with a man known as John Johnson, the father of the children. All the children were born in the parish of Lambeth, which was within the union of Fulham, and they resided there with their parents for three years without break and without relief from the guardians. During those three years Turpin, the husband of Rosa Turpin, resided in the Woolwich Union, so as to become irremovable therefrom and settled therein. In 1903 the children became chargeable to the parish of Fulham, having resided there not quite a year. Fulham thereupon claimed that the children were settled in Woolwich Union. That was denied, and the question was really whether or not the settlement was in Lambeth. The Court of Appeal decided that it was in Lambeth. Hence this appeal. Two points were made by counsel for the appellants. First, that illegitimate children could not acquire a settlement under the age of sixteen, and that, therefore, these children had not acquired a settlement in Lambeth. Clearly up to the time when the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, was passed such children could acquire a settlement in certain circumstances. It was also clear that under the Poor Removal Act, 1846, if they resided in any union for a sufficient time they could acquire a status of irremovability as distinguished from a settlement. In his lordship's opinion section 34 of the Act of 1876 was intended to say, and did say, that all persons of whatever age and whether legitimate or not who had a status of irremovability should be also endowed with a settlement. That was not questioned except as to illegitimate children. But it was argued that the effect of section 35 of the same Act was to qualify section 34 and to make it inapplicable in the case of illegitimate children under sixteen. He did not think so. The two sections dealt with different subjects and were entirely consistent the one with the other. His difficulty on this part of the case had not been how to decide, but how to appreciate the argument. He was not sure it ought not to succeed. The other point made was that in the present case these children did not in fact acquire a settlement under section 34 of the Act of 1876 because they had not acquired a status of irremovability. The Act of 1846 was invoked, together with the Amendment Act of 1848. It was argued that the mother of these children was always removable from Lambeth parish, because, having a husband, she was incapable of acquiring any settlement or status of irremovability, and therefore the children could be removed also. In his lordship's opinion the purpose of section 3 of the Act of 1846 was to prohibit the breaking up of homes, and its effect in this case was to bestow on these children a status of irremovability, and accordingly a settlement. Their father, or reputed father, was irremovable from Lambeth, and it would suffice for this section that either he or the mother was irremovable. There was, in his opinion, no ground for the argument that the effect of section 3 of the Act of 1846 was qualified by the Act of 1848.

The Earl of Halsbury agreed.

Lord MACNAGHTEN read a judgment in which he said he was of opinion that the appeal failed. He agreed in the result at which the Court of Appeal had arrived, but he was unable to adopt the main ground of their decision.

Lord JAMES OF HEREFORD and Lord ATKINSON concurred. The appeal was accordingly dismissed.—COUNSEL, Macmorran, K.C., and Sydney Davey; Rawlinson, K.C., Cox Sinclair, and Lampard. SOLICITORS, T. Blanco White; Callard & Villiamy.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD v. OWNERS OF THE STEAMSHIP "MARPESSA." 4th, 5th, and 29th May.

ADMIRALTY—DAMAGE BY COLLISION—DREDGER—LOSS OF USE OF—TRUSTEES MAKING NO PROFIT—MEASURE OF DAMAGES.

A collision between a ship and a dredger was caused by the fault of the ship. The dredger belonged to the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, and was so damaged by the collision that it had to be laid up for repairs for nine days.

Held, that the true measure of damages, since the dredger was not worked for profit, was the out-of-pocket expenses which the board were compelled to incur notwithstanding that the dredger was laid up, the depreciation upon the dredger, and the loss of interest upon the capital caused by her detention.

Appeal against a judgment of the Court of Appeal confirming the judgment of the President in favour of the respondents, who were the defendants in the court below (reported 1906, P. 95). The facts were stated as follows: The action was brought in rem in the Admiralty Division by the owners of the sand pump dredger *G. B. Crow* (the present appellants) against the owners of the s.s. *Marpessa* (the present respondents) in respect of a collision between that steamship and the dredger. The respondents admitted their liability to the extent of 90 per cent. of the appellants' claim, subject to a reference to the District Registrar assisted by merchants. The only item of claim which was disputed was a claim for nine days' demurrage at £102 a day. The District Registrar having held an inquiry, reported he allowed the appellants £35 a day for the nine days' demurrage with costs against the appellants, thus reducing the appellants' claim from £936 to £315. The *G. B. Crow* was a suction dredger, employed in dredging operations at the bar at the entrance of the River Mersey, and was built in 1895 expressly for that purpose at a cost of over £57,000, and, according to evidence, her life would have been about fifteen years, so that at the date of the collision in 1905 she had about five or six years' more work in her. The contention on behalf of the plaintiffs was that the value of the dredger to them at the time in question was the amount which they considered it proper to expend on

her for maintenance and working expenses, in addition to sums to cover insurance, depreciation, and "owner profits," and upon this basis the actual claim presented at the reference amounted to £102 per day. The defendants contended that the principle upon which the plaintiffs' claim was put forward was wrong, and that the claim ought to have been based upon the principle indicated in the House of Lords in the case of *The Greta Holmes* (1899, A. C. 596), where it was held that the owners of the dredger were only liable to be paid damages for actual out-of-pocket loss, as the principle contended for by the appellants upon which the loss of the dredger should be assessed was purely conjectural and speculative, and was not established by any evidence called before the registrar. *Cur. adv. vult.*

Lord LOREBURN, C., in moving that the appeal should be dismissed, said the question was whether the damages awarded to the appellants were rightly measured in view of the fact that they were precluded from making a profit out of their vessel. She earned nothing in money, and cost a good deal, but she did indispensable service in clearing away sand. Until *The Greta Holmes* case (*supra*) was decided, the view appeared to have prevailed that no damage beyond the actual loss in repairs, loss of wages, and so forth could be recovered where an injured vessel made no money for its owners and merely rendered services in dredging. That case corrected the error, for the damages depended upon the facts and upon the actual loss sustained to the owner, which would vary in different cases. Here the loss sustained was the value of the work which would have been done by the dredger during those nine days had she not been disabled. The plaintiffs put in a mixed claim made up mainly on the basis of what the dredger's service cost them, but they added an item for owners' profits which was appropriate enough if they had paid it to the owners of a vessel which they hired, but had no place in a claim based on the cost to themselves of the services rendered by the dredger. He thought there had been some confusion in the registrar's award in these respects, but he was not prepared to disturb the findings of three tribunals on such a point when the difference between what was found and what in rigorous logic ought to have been found was trifling.

Lords ASHBOURNE, MACNAGHTEN, and ROBERTSON concurred.—COUNSEL, Sir Robert Finlay, K.C., Butler Aspinall, K.C., and Leslie Scott; Pickford, K.C., and Greer. SOLICITORS, Rawle, Johnstone, Gregory, Rouchiffe, & Rouchiffe, for *W. C. Thorne*, Liverpool; Thomas Cooper & Co., for *Hill, Dickinson, Hill, & Roberts*, Liverpool.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

Court of Appeal.

LLOYD AND WIFE v. GREAT WESTERN AND METROPOLITAN DAIRIES (LIM.) AND ANOTHER. No. 1. 29th May.

PRACTICE—ACTION FOR RECOVERY OF LAND—JOINER OF OTHER CAUSES OF ACTION WITHOUT LEAVE—WAIVER—R. S. C. XVIII. 2; LXX. 1, 2.

The joinder, in an action for the recovery of land, of other causes of action without leave having been obtained under ord. 18, r. 2, is an irregularity which may be waived under ord. 70, rr. 1, 2. It is not necessary to the validity of the writ that leave should be obtained before the writ is issued.

Pilcher v. Hinds (27 W. R. 789, 11 Ch. D. 905) explained.

Appeal from an order of Walton, J., at chambers. The plaintiff, John Lloyd, brought an action against the defendants, the writ of summons being indorsed with a claim to recover possession of a house and for damages for wrongfully entering the same and depriving the plaintiff of the profits of the business of a dairyman carried on therein, and for mesne profits, and for an account of the profits of the business, and for an injunction to restrain the defendants, their servants, agents, or assigns, from remaining in or continuing to work or carry on the business at the premises, and for the appointment of a receiver and manager of the business. No leave was obtained under ord. 18, r. 2, to join the causes of action with the claim for recovery of the premises. The action arose out of an agreement for the sale of the lease of the premises and of the business carried on there. Various steps having been taken in the action, the plaintiff applied for and obtained leave to add the female plaintiff as a plaintiff in the action, and the writ as amended was re-served on the defendants. A statement of claim was delivered, and the defendants obtained an extension of time to deliver a defence. Before a defence was delivered the defendants took out a summons to set aside the writ and statement of claim for irregularity upon the ground that leave had not been obtained to join with the claim to recover possession of the premises the other causes of action. Walton, J., made the order asked for. The plaintiffs appealed.

THE COURT (VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, FLETCHER MOULTON, and BUCKLEY, L.J.J.) allowed the appeal.

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.J., said that certain passages from the opinions of the law lords in *Smurthwaite v. Hannay* (43 W. R. 113; 1894, A. C. 494) were relied upon on behalf of the defendants as shewing that this defect was of such a nature that it could not be waived. But that was a case in which the joinder of the several plaintiffs rendered the action altogether unauthorized and ill-constituted under the Judicature Acts and Rules. That could not be said here because ord. 18, r. 2, allowed these causes of action to be joined "by leave of the court or a judge." Therefore the constitution of the action was recognized by the Acts and rules. It was argued that there was no jurisdiction to give leave after the issue of the writ. In his opinion there was no authority for that proposition. The cases shewed that leave had been given after the writ was issued. In his opinion the irregularity was capable of being waived, and it had been

waived in this case, and apart from that, the learned judge could have given leave when the summons to strike out the writ came before him.

FLETCHER MOULTON, L.J., concurred. Ord. 18, r. 2, was intended for the protection of a defendant, and might be waived by him. The defendants alleged that they did not intend to take advantage of the objection if the original plaintiff had remained the sole plaintiff. As, however, the defendants had not taken the objection within a reasonable time the writ must be taken to have been properly issued, and to that writ the court could add a plaintiff, and, if the court did so, that gave no new rights to the defendants.

BUCKLEY, L.J., agreed. In *Fisher v. Hinds* (27 W. R. 789, 11 Ch. D. 905) the application was for indulgence, and that case did not decide that leave must be obtained before the writ was issued. That was made clear by *Muggrave v. Stevens* (W. N., 1881, p. 163). In his opinion leave could be obtained after the issue of the writ, though no doubt the proper practice was to obtain leave before. In the present case leave had in effect been given by the judge when he granted the application to add the female plaintiff as a plaintiff in the action, inasmuch as the judge thereby approved of the writ as it then stood. Further, there was waiver by the defendants of the irregularity under order 70, and the irregularity was one capable of being waived. *Smurthwaite v. Hannay* was not in point because there it was held that the several plaintiffs could not be joined in one action. Here ord. 18, r. 2, allowed the causes of action to be joined upon condition of leave being obtained.—COUNSEL, *Clarke Hall* and *Barrington-Ward*; *Arthur Powell*, K.C., and *Arthur Sims*. SOLICITORS, *F. Freke Palmer*; *T. Lamartine Yates*.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

Re SAMUEL LEWIS (DECEASED). DAVIES v. HARRISON.
Warrington, J. 29th May.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—POWER TO POSTPONE CONVERSION OF ESTATE—PROPERTY NOT ACTUALLY PRODUCING INCOME—TENANT FOR LIFE AND REMAINDERMAN.

A testator devised and bequeathed his residuary real and personal estate to trustees upon trust for sale and conversion, and upon trust to pay the income of the residuary estate to his widow for life, with remainder over. The will contained a power in the usual form authorizing the trustees to postpone conversion of his estate, and provided that "no reversion or other property not actually producing income which shall form part of my estate shall, under the doctrine of constructive conversion or otherwise, be treated as producing income or as entitling any party to the receipt of income." Part of the testator's estate consisted of a sum of money secured by an indenture of mortgage which contained a covenant by the mortgagor to pay the principal with interest from the date of the loan, on the happening of an event which occurred several years after the death of the testator.

Held, that the tenant for life was entitled to an apportioned part of the interest.

Originating summons. Samuel Lewis by his will, dated the 12th of September, 1900, after certain specific and pecuniary bequests, devised and bequeathed his residuary real and personal estate not otherwise disposed of unto his trustees on trust for sale, conversion, and investment, and directed his trustees to pay the income of the said residuary estate to his widow during her life, and after her death the trustees were to hold the trust estate upon various other trusts. The will contained a power in the usual form authorizing the trustees to postpone the sale, conversion, and collection of the whole or any part of his real and personal estate, and then continued: "And I declare that the income produced from every or any part of my residuary real or personal estate previously to the conversion or collection thereof pursuant to the trusts hereinbefore declared shall be applied in the same manner in all respects as if the same were income proceeding from such investments as are hereinbefore directed or authorized, and that the whole of the income produced from my residuary real and personal estate in its actual condition or state of investment for the time being, whether proceeding from property of an authorized or of an unauthorized description and whether of a permanent or a wasting character, shall as well during the first year from my decease as at all times afterwards be applicable as income under the trusts of this my will, no part thereof being in any event liable to be retained as corpus or capital, but no reversion or other property not actually producing income which shall form part of my estate shall, under the doctrine of constructive conversion or otherwise, be treated as producing income or as entitling any party to the receipt of income." The testator died on the 13th of January, 1901, and his estate included a large sum of money secured by an indenture of mortgage dated the 1st of June, 1888, and made between W. G. Craven of the first part, G. Bonnor of the second part, and the testator of the third part. The mortgage, after reciting that W. G. Craven was on the 10th of August, 1887, indebted to the testator in the sum of £18,042, contained the following covenant: "The said W. G. Craven doth hereby covenant with the said S. Lewis that he the said W. G. Craven, his executors, administrators, or assigns, will on the death of him the said W. G. Craven or his son the said A. W. Craven, whichever event shall first happen, pay to the said S. Lewis, his executors, administrators, or assigns, the sum of £18,042, together with simple interest thereon at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum reckoned from the 10th day of August, 1887, up to the time of such death, and if the aggregate amount of such sum and interest or any part thereof shall not then be paid, then and in such case and so long as the same aggregate sum or any part thereof shall remain unpaid, will pay to the said S. Lewis, his executors, administrators, or assigns,

interest for the said aggregate sum or for the unpaid part thereof for the time being at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum by equal half-yearly payments, the first of such payments to become due and be made at the expiration of six calendar months from the death of the said W. G. Craven or A. W. Craven, whichever event shall first happen." W. G. Craven died on the 2nd of January, 1906, and the testator's widow died on the 13th of October, 1906. The question arose whether the interest on the sum of £18,042 should be treated as capital or income, and whether so much of that interest as accrued between the 13th of January, 1901 (the day of the death of the testator), and the 2nd of January, 1906, should be treated as forming part of the estate of the testator's widow. For the tenant for life, the widow, it was argued that the sum of money was "producing" income although the interest was not actually payable until a certain date. Interest on money lent was apportionable by the common law. The case of *Re Hubbuck, Hart v. Stone* (1896, 1 Ch. 754) was relied on. For the remaindermen it was contended that where a trust for conversion is postponed the tenant for life only gets interest of income-producing property: *Mackie v. Mackie* (5 Hare 70); *Rowell v. Bebb* (1900, 2 Ch. 107).

WARRINGTON, J., in giving judgment, said: The question I have to decide in this case is whether the tenant for life under the will of the testator Samuel Lewis is entitled to interest between the date of the testator's death and the 2nd of January, 1906, on a certain sum of money payable on the 2nd of January, 1906, with interest to that date from an anterior date. [His lordship then stated the facts, and continued:] Now, did this property produce income during that period? That is the question I have to determine. The interest, using the language of the deed, during that period has been produced because the mortgagor has now paid, or is going to pay, off the mortgage money with interest. It has been produced, but has it been produced during the lifetime of the tenant for life so as to entitle her to take? [His lordship then read the words of the clause in the will, and continued:] nothing is said about the lifetime of the tenant for life and this property has produced income. The only question is whether the tenant for life is entitled to the interest, although it has not been actually produced in her lifetime. The case is not wholly without authority—*Re Hubbuck, Hart v. Stone*, is to some extent in point. In that case the will of the testator contained a clause very similar to the clause in the present case. There was a debt due to the testator at the time of his death which could not be got in, and the trustees took from the debtor, as security for the debt, a mortgage on certain property. The debtor died in the lifetime of the tenant for life, and the trustees, who had received neither principal nor interest in respect of the debt, realized the security, with the result that they received a sum which was less than the amount due by all the interest and some of the capital. It was held by the Court of Appeal, reversing the decision of Stirling, J., that the sum realized represented arrears of interest as well as capital, and must be apportioned between the tenant for life and the remainderman in the proportion that the interest due from the date of the mortgage bore to the capital thereby secured. The difference here is that in the case of *Re Hubbuck* interest was actually payable during the life of the tenant for life. It was not actually paid owing to the default of the mortgagor. In the present case the reason why interest was not paid until the 2nd of January, 1906, was because the mortgagor was not bound to pay until that day owing to the express covenant in the mortgage deed. Does that make any difference? Now, it is a well known principle of common law confirmed by the Apportionment Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 35), that interest on money lent accrues from day to day. Applying that here, although the interest was not payable and could not be sued for until the 2nd of January, 1906, I think it was interest accruing from day to day. I am of opinion therefore that the interest so produced is payable to the tenant for life.—COUNSEL, *H. Terrell*, K.C., and *E. S. Ford*; *Rowden*, K.C., and *G. F. Hart*; *Cave*, K.C., and *Howard Wright*. SOLICITORS, *A. E. Sydney*; *Harrison & Davies*; *Freshfields*.

[Reported by LEONARD T. FORD, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—King's Bench Division.

WILSON v. CARNLEY. Channell, J. 3rd June.

CONTRACT—PROMISE OF MARRIAGE BY MAN IN LIFETIME OF WIFE TO WOMAN WHO KNOWS PROMISOR IS MARRIED—WHETHER PROMISE CONTRARY TO PUBLIC POLICY.

A promise by a married man to marry a woman on the death of his wife, the woman knowing that the promisor was married, is not void as being contrary to public policy.

Argument on point of law raised by paragraph 3 of the defence in the action. It was alleged in the statement of claim that the defendant verbally promised on the 19th of June, 1894, to marry the plaintiff upon the death of the defendant's wife, who was then living, and that the promise was verbally ratified and renewed by the defendant at Easter, 1897, and also in 1901, and that in January, 1906, the defendant's wife died. The defendant denied the alleged promise and the alleged ratification and renewal, and also pleaded, in paragraph 3 of the defence, that "the alleged promise and renewal and ratification are contrary to public policy and good manners and are illegal and void," and alternatively that he had been released and discharged by the plaintiff from the said promise, and that the plaintiff had conducted herself in a manner inconsistent with the maintenance of an engagement by publishing libels of the defendant, and he counterclaimed for damages for libel. The question

argued in the case was whether a promise by a married man to marry a woman on the death of his wife, the woman knowing that the promisor was married, was void as being contrary to public policy.

CHANNELL, J., said there was no authority on the point. There was, indeed, the dictum of Pollock, C.B., in *Millward v. Littlewood* (1850, 5 Exch. 775) to the effect that such a promise was contrary to public policy, but on the other hand it appeared that Parke, B., did not agree with him, and there was certain not very intelligible authority which seemed to point that way. It was probable that the reason this question had not been decided before was that such a promise was generally accompanied by immorality, in which case the promise would not be binding. The ground on which it was suggested that such a promise as that in this case was contrary to public policy was that it was inconsistent with that affection which ought to exist between man and wife. He did not think that that was necessarily so; for, to take two instances, the wife might be in a lunatic asylum, or the wife herself might, before her death, ask her husband to marry another woman. It could not be said that such a promise as this was necessarily void as being contrary to public policy. The action, therefore, must go for trial.—COUNSEL, H. A. McCardie; *Hugo Young, K.C.*; T. H. Walker; C. E. Dyer. SOLICITORS, Collyer-Bristow, Hill, Curtis, Booth, & Co., for T. N. Loy, Alford; Richard Brooks.

[Reported by C. G. MORAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

CASWELL AND ANOTHER v. CHESHIRE LINES COMMITTEE.

Div. Court. 31st May; 3rd June.

COMMON CARRIERS—LIABILITY OF—ORDINARY PERSONAL LUGGAGE CARRIED WITH PASSENGER FREE OF CHARGE—LOSS OF—CARRIERS ACT, 1830 (1 WILL. 4, c. 68), ss. 1, 2, 6.

Section 1 of the Carriers Act, 1830, applies to the ordinary personal luggage accompanying a passenger on a railway which, within certain limits of weight, is carried free of charge.

Appeal by the defendants from a decision of a county court judge, adjudging to the plaintiffs the sum of £49 9s. 2d. for the loss of a box, part of their luggage which they took with them on a journey over the defendants' railway and which was lost on the journey. The box contained various articles enumerated in section 1 of the Carriers Act, 1830, such as silver toilet articles and trinkets, and the defendants gave notice of defence under that Act. The county court judge found as a fact that the articles in the box were the ordinary personal luggage of the plaintiffs, and he held that section 1 of the Carriers Act, 1830, did not apply to the ordinary personal luggage of passengers which railway companies within certain specified weights are bound to carry free. The following regulation was in the defendants' time tables, to which the tickets taken by the plaintiffs were stated to be subject: "Weight allowed free.—First class ordinary and tourist passengers are allowed 150lbs. and third class ordinary and tourist passengers 100lbs. of personal luggage only (not being merchandise, or other articles carried for hire or profit) free of charge." On the appeal it was agreed between the parties that the value of the articles in the lost box not within section 1 of the Carriers Act, 1830, was £20. The argument for the respondent was that the Carriers Act, 1830, did not apply to ordinary personal luggage accompanying the passenger which within certain limits of weight may be carried free of charge, as it was plain from the language of the Carriers Act, 1830, that it only applied to articles on which there was already a charge for carriage. The Railways Construction Facilities Act, 1864, and various special Acts passed since that date must be taken to have impliedly repealed that Act as regards the baggage which by those enactments might be carried with the passenger free of charge. In any case the contract with the passenger to carry him for a price and his luggage free of charge was a special contract which would exclude the application of the Carriers Act, 1830: see section 6 of that Act. It was absurd to say that a passenger must declare the value of such articles as silver monograms on his toilet set and silk on his dress-coat, when the value of the articles was over £10, in order to avoid the protection given to the railway company by the Carriers Act, 1830.

DARLING, J., said that luggage which accompanied a passenger, as well as that which did not, was subject to the provisions of the Carriers Act, 1830. That was clear on authority. But it was contended that the Carriers Act, 1830, did not apply to luggage which under various special Acts was carried free of charge. But it was clear that in *Macrow v. The Great Western Railway Co.* (19 W. R. 873; L. R. 6 Q. B. 612) it was thought that the Carriers Act, 1830, did apply to such luggage. That opinion, though obiter, was one expressed by very eminent judges, and he was of opinion that there was no implied repeal of the Carriers Act, 1830, as regards such luggage. Further, he thought that the contract with regard to this luggage was a special contract, but it was a special contract for the carriage of the luggage only, not a special contract in respect of the extra risk involved—one in the nature of insurance such as that in section 6 of the Carriers Act, 1830. The contract here, therefore, was not a special contract within that section. He thought, therefore, that the appeal must be allowed.

A. T. LAWRENCE, J., delivered judgment to the same effect.—COUNSEL, Russell, K.C.; J. A. Simon; C. Atkinson. SOLICITORS, C. Dunderdale, London and Manchester; Cunliffe & Davenport, for Lingards & Hamp, Manchester.

[Reported by C. G. MORAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

ALLINSON v. CUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL.

Div. Court. 30th and 31st May.

HIGHWAY—REPAIR OF COUNTY BRIDGE ON—RIGHT TO TAKE STONES FROM BED OF RIVER—RIVER FLOWING BETWEEN ENCLOSED LANDS—WHETHER A RIVER IS "ENCLOSED LAND"—HIGHWAY ACT, 1835 (5 & 6 WILL. 4, c. 50), ss. 51 to 53—4 & 5 VICT. c. 51.

A river flowing between fields that are enclosed, belonging to the same owner, is "enclosed land or ground" within the meaning of sections 51 and 53 of the Highway Act, 1835.

Appeal from the decision of a county court judge, given in favour of the plaintiff, in an action for damages for trespass. The trespass complained of was taking materials from the bed of a river and carting them along an occupation road. Thence they were taken on to a highway to repair a county bridge. The river, from the bed of which the materials were taken, flowed between fields belonging to the same owner—the plaintiff—which were enclosed. The defendants claimed a right to take the stones under section 51 of the Highway Act, 1835, on the ground that a river was not "enclosed land or ground" within the meaning of sections 51 and 53 of the Highway Act, and the terms of section 55 of the Act were referred to as supporting that contention. The county court judge found that the bed of the river was agricultural land, and held that the river was "enclosed land or ground" within the meaning of the above-mentioned sections.

THE COURT (DARLING and A. T. LAWRENCE, JJ.), on appeal, held that the surveyor (and those who now exercise his powers) could not take stones from a river in enclosed land without first obtaining the consent of the owner of the bed of the river or a licence from the two justices sitting at petty sessions pursuant to sections 51 and 53 of the Highway Act. A river with enclosed land on both sides of it was "enclosed land or ground" within the meaning of those sections. In any case, as the county court judge had found that the bed of this river was agricultural land, the bed, having regard to the terms of 4 & 5 VICT. c. 51, must be considered as enclosed land. The appeal, therefore, must be dismissed.—COUNSEL, J. Trustram; S. Mayer. SOLICITORS, A. Tovey, for Allen Hodgson, Carlisle; Tatham & Procter, for Broatch & Son, Keswick.

[Reported by C. G. MORAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

LEVENE v. MATON.

Joyce, J. (sitting as a judge of the K. B. Div.)

26th April; 3rd and 17th May.

ATTACHMENT OF DEBTS—GARNISHEE ISSUE—PRACTICE—PARTIES—PROPERTY—PROCEEDS OF CHEQUE OBTAINED BY FRAUD—RIGHT TO FOLLOW THE PROCEEDS.

The right of a judgment creditor obtaining a garnishee order against the fund attached is similar to that of an assignee taking subject to all equities against the assignor; it is therefore not necessary that the judgment debtor should be a party to an issue stated to determine whether the judgment creditor or the person seeking to enforce such an equity has the better right to the fund in dispute.

Where a cheque was obtained by means of false pretences by the payee, held, that the transaction could be avoided by the drawer of the cheque, and thereupon the property in the proceeds of the cheque being represented by a balance at a bank in the name of the payee re-vested in the drawer.

The facts appear from the judgment.

JOYCE, J.—This is the trial of an interpleader issue to determine who is entitled to a sum of £70, which is in a bank to the credit of Kyte, the execution debtor. The plaintiff is a well-known money-lender, and his case is that the execution debtor, by false pretences amounting to a misdemeanour, induced the plaintiff to discount by a cheque for £70 the execution debtor's promissory note for £100. It is not alleged that the property in the cheque and the money did not pass to Kyte, but that the contract is void, and that the plaintiff can rescind, trace, and recover the very money which represents the proceeds of the cheque. Although the point is arguable, I have felt no difficulty in deciding that the money can be traced and identified, having regard to *Miller v. Rans* (1 Smith's Leading Cases 463), and the notes to that case. The execution debtor is not a party, although he is certainly interested, as, if the £70 is the property of the plaintiff, the debt of the execution creditor will not be reduced or in part discharged by that amount. I have felt some hesitation as to this, but following *Cole v. Eley* [1894, 2 Q. B. 350], I must treat this case as if the execution creditor had obtained an assignment of this £70 subject to all rights against Kyte in respect of that sum. I must find that the case of fraud has been sufficiently proved for the determination of this issue, although I doubt the credibility of the plaintiff's testimony. The alleged misrepresentation was verbal and depends on the sole evidence of the plaintiff. He carries on an extensive trade and sees many clients, and yet he professed to repeat a conversation which took place between him and Kyte at an interview on the 19th of May, 1906; his evidence suggests that there was a memorandum or note of what passed, but that note is not forthcoming. The debtor was not called by the execution creditor because he was prosecuted to conviction by the judgment creditor and sentenced to imprisonment. The debtor would not have been bound to expose himself to a criminal charge. As I must decide on the evidence which is before me, with some hesitation I must find *prima facie* that the £70 is so situated as to be belong to the plaintiff. The action was necessary to establish title. Each party will bear their own costs of the trial before me.—COUNSEL, Younger, K.C., and J. B. Matthews; Morton W. Smith. SOLICITORS, D. Barnett; Bramall & White, for H. S. Smith, Devizes.

[Reported by A. B. OPPÉ, Barrister-at-Law.]

Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.

LETT v. LETT. 28th May.

DIVORCE—MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACT, 1857 (20 & 21 VICT. c. 85), s. 27—SUMMARY JURISDICTION (MARRIED WOMEN) ACT, 1895 (58 & 59 VICT. c. 39)—SEPARATION ORDER—DESERPTION—STATUTORY PERIOD.

When a wife does not obtain the separation order from the justices until after the statutory period of desertion for two years and upwards is completed, such order is no bar to her pleading such desertion in a subsequent suit for divorce.

So held by Bucknill, J., distinguishing Smith v. Smith (1905, P. 249), Dodd v. Dodd (1906, P. 189), Falles v. Falles (1906, P. 326), Taylor v. Taylor (51 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 515), and other cases.

A suit for divorce on the ground of a husband's adultery and desertion. The parties were married in 1902. The respondent deserted the petitioner on the 16th of January, 1903. On the 26th of January, 1905, the petitioner applied to the Marylebone magistrate for a separation order, which was granted, on the ground of the respondent's desertion. At the time of the application the petitioner was unaware of her husband's adultery. It was submitted that she could rely upon the plea of desertion in so much as the statutory period of two years, as required by section 27 of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1857 (20 & 21 Vict. c. 85), as had elapsed before she applied for the order, and that the recent and conflicting decisions on the effect of these orders were not in point.

BUCKNILL, J., said that the Summary Jurisdiction (Married Women) Act, 1895, was not intended to affect the jurisdiction of the Divorce Court. Each case must be judged upon its own merits. In the present case he would grant a decree nisi, for although the petitioner knew of her husband's desertion, she was ignorant of his adultery.—COUNSEL, H. C. Dickens. SOLICITOR, Vessey.

[Reported by DIOBY COTTE-PREEDY, Barrister-at-Law.]

Societies.

Law Association.

The ninetieth annual general court of the Law Association for the benefit of widows and families of solicitors in the metropolis and vicinity was held at the Law Society's Hall on the 30th of May, Mr. C. Burt, one of the vice-presidents, being in the chair. Among those present were Mr. S. J. Daw (treasurer), Mr. T. H. Gardiner, Mr. E. T. H. Brandon, Mr. R. H. Peacock, Mr. A. Toovey, Mr. J. Vallance, and Mr. M. Waters (directors), and several members, including Messrs. E. S. Courroux, G. M. Davey, P. W. B. Tippetts, and E. E. Barron (the secretary).

The directors' report and balance-sheet for the year ending the 20th of May were submitted. After setting out the investments, the report states the receipts of the association for the past year were as follows: Dividends on investments, £1,325 15s. 4d.; annual subscriptions, £308 14s.; donations, £31 10s.; life subscriptions, £63; total, £1,728 19s. 4d. The expenses of the year amounted to £251 13s. 7d., leaving a balance of £1,477 5s. 9d., which, with £308 4s. 2d. balance from 1906, made an available income for the year of £1,785 9s. 11d. Out of this the directors have distributed £701 0s. 8d. amongst twelve members' cases and £673 3s. 9d. amongst thirty-five non-members' cases, making the total relief granted £1,374 4s. 5d. There remains a cash balance in hand of £411 5s. 6d. towards the expenditure of the current year. Since the formation of the association in 1817 the amount of relief granted to members and their families is £78,250 6s. 8d., and to other London solicitors (non-members) and their families £16,952 10s. 3d., making a grand total of £95,202 16s. 11d. With deep regret the directors have to report the deaths of the following members of the association: Mr. Thomas Dolling Bolton, M.P. (for many years a trustee and director), Mr. Stephen Abye Ram (for several years a director), Mr. Samuel Chester, Mr. Alexander James Murray, Mr. Thomas Boone Nelson, Mr. J. R. Ratcliff, and Mr. Alfred Wright Surtees. Nineteen new members have joined the association during the past year, of whom six are life members, making a total of 433 members, of whom 135 are life members.

Mr. MARK WATERS, as chairman of the board during the past financial year, moved the adoption of the report, after calling attention to the continued increase in the membership, both life members and annual subscribers, and the consequent increase in the association's funds, and also dwelt upon the increased claims on the association and assistance rendered during the past year.

The motion having been seconded by Mr. PEACOCK, who dwelt on the careful consideration that was given by the directors to every claim that came before them, the report and balance-sheet were unanimously adopted.

The Lord Chief Justice was re-elected president, Mr. Mark Waters was appointed a trustee in the place of the late Mr. T. Dolling Bolton, and the vice-presidents, board of directors, and other officers were re-appointed.

Society of City and Borough Clerks of the Peace.

The fifteenth annual meeting of the above society was held at the Guildhall, Nottingham, on the 28th of May, Sir SAMUEL G. JOHNSON, Clerk of the Peace for Nottingham, the president, in the chair. Members from such distant places as Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Maidstone, and Bristol attended.

Various subjects, including the Criminal Appeal Bill, 1907, extension of jurisdiction of quarter sessions, and points of practice, were discussed.

The officers elected for the ensuing year are: President, A. Copson Penke (Leeds); vice-president, G. Trevelyan Lee (Derby); treasurer, A. Copson Penke (Leeds); hon. secretary, Francis Ogden (Manchester); committee, J. Binney (Sheffield), H. Brevitt (Wolverhampton), W. H. Duignan (Walsall), F. B. Harris (Nottingham), J. Routledge (Pontefract), Dr. Herbert Woodhouse (Hull), and J. Gibson Youll (Newcastle-upon-Tyne).

The United Law Clerks' Society.

The seventy-fifth anniversary festival dinner of the United Law Clerks' Society was held, on the 31st ult., at the Hotel Cecil. Mr. Justice WARRINGTON presided, and the company included Mr. Cave, K.C., M.P., Mr. Rawlinson, K.C., M.P., Mr. J. Eldon Banks, K.C., and Mr. A. J. Walter, K.C.

The CHAIRMAN, in proposing "Prosperity to the United Law Clerks' Society," said the society performed a double function. It was first and foremost a benefit society, and by means of periodical contributions from its members it had formed, and was forming, a fund from which by contract those members were entitled to certain benefits in sickness or old age, as the case might be. In addition it was a benevolent society, and it was in that function that it appealed most to them that night. By means of the subscriptions which it obtained from outsiders the society was able not only to carry out its contracts with subscribing members, but to give to members and non-members assistance in cases of emergency. In the past twenty-five years the membership had increased by more than 50 per cent., and the members' subscriptions to the General Benefit Fund had more than doubled, though the donations showed a slight decrease. But the claims upon the fund had increased very considerably, and for that reason he appealed to them to give it all the support in their power.

Mr. HENRY SPRAY, hon. treasurer, submitted the annual report, which stated that the money disbursed during the last 25 years for benefits was nearly £100,000, against £70,938 during the first 50 years. He said that, although the work of the society had greatly increased, the management expenses, including minor benefits, amounted 25 years ago to 13 per cent. of the total income, and this year they only amounted to 9 per cent. of the total income.

Other toasts followed, that of "The Legal Profession" being proposed by Mr. J. ELDON BANKS, K.C., and responded to by Mr. RAWLINSON, K.C., M.P., and Mr. BOURCHIERE HAWKLEY.

Law Students' Journal. Council of Legal Education.

The following is the result of the general examination of students of the Inns of Court, held in Lincoln's-inn Hall on the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th of May. L.I. means Lincoln's-inn; I.T., Inner Temple; M.T., Middle Temple; and G.I., Gray's-inn:—

ROMAN LAW.

The following students passed in Roman Law:

Class I.—Edmund Pelly Chapman, L.I.; Henry Watt Dollar and Frederick Harper Hammett, M.T.; Harnam Singh, G.I.; Thomas Joseph Stokes, M.T.; Mervyn Lawrence Tew, L.I.

Class II.—Pramatha Nath Chatterjee and John Discombe, G.I.; Patrick Duncan, I.T.; Henry Percy Glover, L.I.; Victor William John Hobbs, Archibald Kenneth Ingram, and Edwin Gray Moneylaws Phillips, I.T.; Frank Louis Ratto, M.T.; Edgar Taunton, I.T.; John Fiske Wilkes, L.I.; Walter Lightowler Wilkinson, M.T.

Class III.—Moreswar Vasudeo Abhyankar, L.I.; Ali-Uddin Ahmad, Razi Uddin Ahmad, William Valentine Aldridge, and Edward John Arnett, M.T.; Geoffrey Aspinall, I.T.; Herbert Austin and Arnold Harding Ball, G.I.; George Henry Belas, I.T.; Jal Khurshedji Butonji Bomanji, G.I.; Jamahedji Merwanji Boyce, L.I.; Joseph Samuel Bridges, I.T.; Mulraj Buxi, M.T.; John Carey, G.I.; Tirgoji Narayan Chadha, M.T.; Mannatha Pal Choudhuri, L.I.; Herbert Clark, M.T.; Reginald Charles Arthur Close and Thomas George Frederick Cochran, I.T.; Ernest Bovell Connell, M.T.; Thomas Edward Curtis, G.I.; Gerard William Daman, I.T.; Ganesh Datta, L.I.; Christopher Wilford Dawson, M.T.; John Paul de Castro, L.I.; Frederick Joseph de Verteuil and Horatio Aung Din, G.I.; Edward James Ercutt and John Herbert Evans-Jackson, M.T.; James Clerk Maxwell Garnett, I.T.; Paul Antoine Frederick Pierre Geneve, M.T.; Frank William George, G.I.; Lindsay Harold Haynes, L.I.; Reginald Powell Croom Johnson, I.T.; Saiyid Bashiruddin Ahmad Khan, M.T.; Hari Krishan Lal, G.I.; Kumara Gopal Menon, M.T.; Harold Gustave Meyer, I.T.; George Henry Mills and George Dick Montsion, L.I.; Susil-Chandra Mukhopadhyay and Bu Mya, M.T.; Sohrab Manekji Nanavatty, G.I.; Arthur William Neville and Cyril Arthur Oliver, M.T.; Frederic Clyde Patton, I.T.; Frank Herbert Ernest Reed and John Seymour Blake Reed, G.I.; Geoffrey Arnold Ripley, I.T.; William Martin St. Leonard Saunders, M.T.; Mohamed Masoud Hasan Siddiqi, L.I.; Henry Conrad Nobert Amarth Sinha and Ernest Warren Summers, I.T.; Luther James Swallow and Gilbert John Taylor, L.I.; George Lee Wanless, I.T.; Roger Escombe Willecks, M.T.; Alfred Wragge, I.T.

Of 105 examined 75 passed. Two candidates were ordered not to be admitted for examination again until the Hilary examination, 1908.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND LEGAL HISTORY.

The following students passed in Constitutional Law (English and Colonial) and Legal History:

Class I.—Lennox Arthur Patrick O'Reilly, L.I.

Class II.—Robert Bruce Foster, L.I.; Michael Harry Godby, I.T.; Henry Beaufort Inglefield and Charles Clifton Roberts, M.T.; James Alexander George Smith, L.I.; William Francis Swords, M.T.

Class III.—Khabeeruddin Ahmed, G.I.; Mahomed Shakir Ali, L.I.; Maung Bah Saing, M.T.; Santi Priya Basu, L.I.; Thomas Henry Bethell, I.T.; Sohrab Dadabhoj Bhedwar and Chimanlal Bhudar Bhojuck, M.T.; Cecil Rodolph Blake, L.I.; Manikkum Edumbas Brahma-Nandan and Edwin Harold Britter, M.T.; John Carey, G.I.; Hon. Reginald Coke,

I.T.; Ernest William Collyer, M.T.; Oliver Henry Covington, L.I.; Richard Talbot Cox, M.T.; Cyril Cutlack, L.I.; John Oledwyn Davies, M.T.; Stuart Spencer Davis and Gaur Mohan De, G.I.; Keshabendra Krishna Deb, L.I.; Patrick Duncan, I.T.; John Freeman Dunn and Anadi Chunder Dutt, G.I.; Henry Wippell Gadd, M.T.; Henry Percy Glover and Eugene Grant, L.I.; Roland Vaughan Gwynne and Kismet Leland Brewer Hamilton, I.T.; Reginald Charles Cromwell Hockley, M.T.; Frederick John Van der Byl Hopley, I.T.; Richard John Humphreys, G.I.; Francis Joseph Jeffries, M.T.; Reginald Powell Croom Johnson, I.T.; Sydney Douglas Selbourne Jones and Rasik Behari Lal, M.T.; Pradist Luang, G.I.; Evelyn John Maude, L.I.; Harold Gustave Meyer, I.T.; Rabindra Nath Mitter, L.I.; Arthur Morley and Percival Halton Morris, M.T.; Geoffrey Moseley, I.T.; Kanwar Narain, L.I.; Indra Narayan, M.T.; Badil Nath, I.T.; Robert Herie Nicholson, L.I.; Rupert Charles Ollivant, I.T.; Henry Bertram Ommaney and Candido Ontanon, G.I.; William Owen, M.T.; William Charles Pilley and William Henry Prescott, G.I.; Walter Fitzroy Frederic Prins, M.T.; Harold John Pullman, I.T.; John Seymour Blake Reed, G.I.; Charles Wheatstone Sabine and Syam Krishna Sahay, M.T.; Mohammad Shareef, G.I.; Mohamad Masudul Hasan Siddiqi and Pestonji Cursetji Tarapore, L.I.; Edgar Taunton, I.T.; Noel Thatcher, G.I.; David Thomas, M.T.; Mom Chow Thong-Chuor, Richard Squire Thorne, John Bevan Coulson Tregarthen, George Lee Wanless, Charles Hillary Wild, Robert Willis, Alfred Wragge, and Percival Arthur Wrixon, I.T.; Joseph Michael Xavier, M.T.

Out of 97 examined, 79 passed.

EVIDENCE, PROCEDURE, AND CRIMINAL LAW.

The following students passed in evidence, procedure (civil and criminal), and criminal law:—

Class I.—Evans Gustavus Cooper, G.L.; Frederick Murray Hicks, I.T.
Class II.—Samuel Josiah Sigismund Barlett, G.I.; Edward Neville Bewley and Edward Henry Swinburne Bligh, I.T.; Boon Chuay, G.I.; Percy Theodore Carden, I.T.; Fernand Edward Christien, M.T.; Ralph Charles Fairbairn Cotton, L.I.; Edward Percy Everest, M.T.; William Forbes, G.I.; Charles Cyril Gerahty, M.T.; Neils Jonas Dowona Hammond, L.I.; Har Dyal, M.T.; Geoffrey Dudley Hobson and William George Litt, I.T.; Sarat Sasi Mallik, G.I.; Harold Gustave Meyer and William Nugent Owen, I.T.; Emmanuel William Quartey-Papafio and Cyril Dunstan Shaw, L.I.

Class III.—Sidney Abrahams and Arjun Nath Atal, M.T.; Harold Lansdowne Beale, Scott Birkbeck, and Frederick Briggs, L.I.; Mulraj Buxi, M.L.; Henry James Casey, I.T.; Jagmohan Nath Chak, M.T.; Rajendra Narayan Chauhuri, L.I.; Thomas George Frederick Cochrane, I.T.; Charles Corfield, Theon Constantine Cotroni, and Edgar Thorniley Dale, M.T.; Thomas George Rudolph Dehn and Bertrand Ward Devae, I.T.; Edward Aylmer Digby, M.T.; Horatio Aung Din, G.I.; Henry Doncaster Dracott, M.T.; Frederick William Dunn, G.I.; Lucius George Patrick Eiffe, Frederick William Evans, and Richard Bracken Farrer, I.T.; Ernest Alfred Faunch, G.I.; Algernon Horace Flint and Robert Bruce Foster, L.I.; John Gadsby, I.T.; Frederick William Galloway, M.T.; Henry Percy Glover, L.I.; Kismet Leland Brewer Hamilton, I.T.; Vyvyan Beresford Holland and Francis Evelyn Mohammed Hosein, L.I.; Albert James Charlton Humphreys, I.T.; Marcus Hyman, G.I.; Francis Joseph Jeffries, M.T.; Reginald Powell Croom Johnson and Benazir Jung, I.T.; Bhikaji Byramji Kanga, M.T.; Robert Walter Edmund Knollys, I.T.; Robert Walter Lomax, M.T.; Girdhari Lal Maheshwary, G.I.; Leonard Morgan May, L.I.; Lawrence Mead, Andrew Charles Fermin Morasso, and Percival Halton Morris, M.T.; Paul Bouchier Moxon, L.I.; Choitram Dhanrajnal Mukhi and Susilchandra Mukhopadhyay, M.T.; Horace Stuart Myer, I.T.; Basudha Kanta Nag, L.I.; Kidar Nath, G.I.; Oliffe Richmond Nicholas, I.T.; Eustace Marmion Ferrers Nicholson and Brinsley Hampton Nixon, M.T.; Henry Bertram Ommaney, G.I.; Henry Arthur Payne, I.T.; Percy John Probyn, L.I.; Mirza Mohamed Rafi, M.T.; Philip Ferdinand Rosettenstein and Garaddee Rudrappa, G.I.; Charles Frederick Ryder, I.T.; Horace Barnett Samuel, M.T.; James Yuill Scott, I.T.; Sunanda Chunder Sen, L.I.; Robert Workman Smith, I.T.; Duncan Gardner Wallace, M.T.; Herbert Coleridge Watson and Herbert Stewart Wilson, I.T.; Francis Aslett Wray, G.I.; Joseph Michael Xavier, M.T.

There were 111 examined, of whom 90 passed.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

Class I. (in order of merit).—Joe Brook Richardson, M.T., studentship of 100 guineas per annum, tenable for three years; certificates of honour to Arthur Frederic Andrew Cole and William Cleveland Cleveland-Stevens, L.I.; John Benjamin Lindenbaum, I.T.; Wilfrid Alexander Barton, G.I.; Harold Oddy Sutcliffe Wright, Thomas Drake Bucknill, and Austin Lloyd Jones, I.T.; Pembroke Wicks, M.T.

Class II. (in order of merit).—Cyril Leonard Ross Thomas, M.T.; Reginald Warren Hale Wilkinson, I.T.; San Shwe, Frederick Peel Eldon Leonard Potter, and Hugh Melchisedec Green, G.I.; Robert Hardy Topham, I.T.; Panna Lal, G.I.; Richard Brinsley Cassavetti Sheridan, M.T.; Charanjit Rai, Harold Church, and Thomas Andrzejewski Pace, L.I.; Frederick Eardley-Smith, I.T.; Adrian Russell Woutner and John Seymour Blake Reed, G.I.; Alan Lachlan Gordon Walker, M.T.; Alexander Mackenzie Drysdale, G.I.; Edward Ingham, L.I.; George Kyaw Din, G.I.; Richard Leopold Reiss, L.I.; the two following equal—Thomas William Naylor Barlow, L.I., and Reginald Powell Croom Johnson, I.T.; Herbert Asquith, L.I.; Thomas Hugh Conolly Blaikie and Frank Henry John Baber, I.T.; Thomas Charles John Cragoe Jenkin, G.I.; Alfred Taylor, M.T.; Gavin George Halsey, L.I.; Joseph Shaw and Robert Temple Cannot, M.T.; Henry Pelham Rashleigh, L.I.; Mohamad Yusuf (No. 2), M.T.

Class III. (in alphabetical order).—Arthur Neville Aston, L.I.; Maurice Barnett, G.I.; Leslie Harry Rupert Barr, M.T.; Antonio Joaquim Basto, L.I.; Christopher Llewellyn Bennett, I.T.; Ratnakrishna Curran Bonnerjee, M.T.; Sailindra Krishna Bose, G.I.; Gilbert Eric Cannan, I.T.; Harold Bernard Copinger, M.T.; Alexander Macneil Cowan, G.I.; Theodore Leslie Crombie, L.I.; Wilfrid George Cuthbert-Gundry, M.T.; Walter Leslie Farquhar Davies and Sidney Martin Edwards, I.T.; Clarence George Eugene Fletcher, G.I.; Joshua Goodland, Richard Frederick Hayward, and Humphrey Noel Howorth, I.T.; William Felix Henry Jeffes and Thomas Caradog John, G.I.; Edward Hubert Gunter Jones, I.T.; Percy Tyson Lewis, M.T.; Herbert William Malkin, I.T.; Alfred Mangena, L.I.; Robert Forster McCall, M.T.; Michael Francis Joseph McDonnell, I.T.; Cyril Arthur Oliver, M.T.; John Akinola Otonba Payne, I.T.; Mudujil Keaava Narayana Pillai and John Mervyn Pollen, M.T.; Frederick John Pollock, L.I.; George Allan Powell, G.I.; Mian Samiuddin, M.T.; James Yuill Scott, I.T.; Ernest Whitcome Shepperson, G.I.; John Simonds, L.I.; Kapur Singh, G.I.; Edwin Smith, M.T.; Adrian Leslie Stephen, I.T.; Arthur Ralph Stevens, L.I.; Henry Guy Webber and John Douglas Young, I.T.

The number examined was 102, of whom 82 passed.

Legal News.

Appointments.

Mr. JOHN EAGLETON, solicitor, of Chancery-lane, Clerk of the Fruiterers' Company, has been appointed Clerk of the Haberdashers' Company, in succession to the late Mr. J. Hamilton Townend.

Mr. FRANCIS JOHN GAMLIN, of Rhyl, solicitor, has been appointed Clerk to the Rhyl, Prestatyn, and St. Asaph Justices, in the place of the late Mr. Oliver George.

Mr. FRANCIS JOHN GAMLIN, of Rhyl, has been appointed a Notary Public for Rhyl and District. He was admitted a solicitor in 1889.

General.

The Married Women's Property Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons on Tuesday.

The Attorney-General will give his dinner in honour of the King's birthday on Friday evening, the 28th inst., at Claridge's Hotel.

Mr. Justice Bigham has fixed the next sitting of the Railway and Canal Commission Court at the Royal Courts of Justice for Tuesday, the 23rd of July.

The past and present members of the Durham Quarter Sessions Bar entertained the Right Hon. John Lloyd Wharton at dinner this week at the Imperial Restaurant, Regent-street, on his retirement as chairman of the Durham County Quarter Sessions. Mr. Justice Ridley was in the chair.

The expenses of the defence in the Thaw trial, says a Central News telegram, which amount to £50,000, have now been paid. Mr. Delmas has received £10,000, while another of the defending counsel, whose name is not disclosed, has received £20,000, and it is reported that he asked for £20,000 more.

A meeting of the Society of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions was held on Tuesday, at the Guildhall, Westminster, when Lord Cross was unanimously re-elected president and Sir John E. Dorington vice-president. The society considered the Criminal Appeal Bill, 1907, and discussed other matters affecting quarter sessions.

Mr. Robert Edleston, of Hollybrook, Ilkley, Yorks, who has, says the *Evening Standard*, died at the age of twenty-six, disposed of his fortune of £42,556 in the following eighteen words (about £2,350 a word), written on a sheet of notepaper: "I leave all that I am possessed of to my sisters, Marian and Frances Edleston, in equal shares."

Mr. Justice Bray declared at the Dorset Assizes, says the *Evening Standard*, that people could not realize how heavy the work of the judges was. Most of them were of somewhat advanced age, and they had to sit week after week and every day in the week. Their attention had to be kept on stretch practically every minute, and their work was not ended when they went out of court.

It is announced that the commission day for the summer assizes at Liverpool on the Northern Circuit has been altered from Monday, the 15th of July, to Saturday, the 13th of July. By an error in the official circuit paper, the commission day for Lincoln at the present summer assizes is given as Friday, the 21st of June, and that for Derby as Thursday, the 27th of June, whereas the correct dates are Derby, Friday, the 21st of June; Lincoln, Saturday, the 29th of June.

A remarkable scandal has, says the *Globe*, broken out in the Italian judicial body, under circumstances of gravity for which it would be difficult to find a parallel in modern times in any great State of Europe. Grave accusations were brought forward in the Chamber against the judges and magistrates of the province of Catanzaro, the Press raked up abundance of fuller detail, and now the Minister of Justice has felt himself compelled to act. Thirteen men are suspended for corruption, of whom eight are judges of the High Court and five preside over magisterial tribunals. One is first president of the provincial Court of Appeal, another is president of a section of the Appeal Court, and six others are judges.

The thirty-eighth meeting of the Bankruptcy Law Amendment Committee was held on the 29th ult. at the Royal Courts of Justice, Mr. Muir Mackenzie, the chairman, presiding. Evidence was given by Mr. T. H. Winder, the Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the District of the County Court at Bolton, and Mr. C. E. Harrop (of the firm of Messrs. Sam Harrop & Sons (Limited), provision dealers, of Manchester), the former of whom gave the committee the benefit of his experience in the administration of the Bankruptcy Acts since 1884, and the latter of whom dealt with cases which arose in the wholesale provision trade.

The first meeting of creditors under a receiving order against Mr. Godfrey Lawford, solicitor, of Austin Friars, E.C., was, says the *Standard*, held on the 3rd inst. at the London Bankruptcy Court. The chairman read a list of proofs of claims amounting to £26,000, and said that the total liabilities would probably be twice that sum. One of the claims was for at least £10,000 by the Marquis of Northampton, and another was for £7,500 for trust funds, which, it is alleged, have been misappropriated. The official receiver said that Mr. Lawford had not surrendered, and there did not seem to be much prospect that he would surrender. It seemed that he earned about £1,500 a year from his profession, but he engaged in speculations on the Stock Exchange, and his losses there were undoubtedly responsible for his failure. The matter went into bankruptcy.

The scheme of land registration which has been in force in the county of London for eight years has, says the *Property Market Review*, been much assailed. Sir Henry Kimber, in an unstarred question to the Attorney-General, declares that it has proved to be practically a failure, and that it adversely affects the marketability of property by adding greatly to the expense, difficulty, and delay in dealings with property. He therefore suggests the revocation of the Order of the Privy Council applying the experiment to London. Sir J. Lawson Walton replies that the Government have no intention of recommending that the Order in Council should be revoked, but have it in contemplation to inquire into the working of the Land Transfer Acts with a view to the removal of any alleged objections. He states that no other county has applied to be brought under the Act. [We did not find the question and answer reported in the daily journals.]

Apropos of our remarks in reference to "Mr. Samuel Warren," Mr. R. S. Hopper, of Whitley Bay, says: "I have the recollection of his being in the North as a Lunacy Commissioner when I was a 'legal fledgling.' He was conducting a lunacy inquiry not very far from where I now live. The subject matter arose out of proceedings emanating from the office where I was articled. Mr. Warren was a member of the Northern Circuit (now subdivided). On an occasion when he was on circuit a wag of a barrister wrote a 'squib' which ran as follows:

"If Warren, the wittiest and wisest of men,
Had stuck to his briefs instead of his pen,
He might have had "Ten Thousand a Year"
Instead of a brief "Now and Then."

Of course that is a play upon two of his well-known works, but it demonstrates the accuracy of your conclusion."

Mr. Gladstone, in a printed reply to questions by Sir Gilbert Parker on the Edalji case states that Mr. Edalji was released in October last at the end of three years, because it was considered that the sentence originally passed upon him was unduly severe. "This was my predecessor's decision in August, 1905, which I carried out in October, 1906. In the absence of a right of appeal to a higher court, the grant of a free pardon, whether the term is considered appropriate or not, is the only means by which a person can be relieved of the consequences of a conviction, whether wrongful or otherwise. Compensation has in certain exceptional cases been granted to innocent persons who have suffered imprisonment, but the question of payment of compensation must depend upon the circumstances of each individual case. The reasons which have led me to advise the grant of a free pardon without compensation to Mr. Edalji are shown in the papers which have been laid before Parliament, and I have nothing to add to what is contained in them."

Mr. Choate, the eminent American advocate, had, says the *Central Law Journal*, a singular experience when the American Tobacco Co. was on trial for violating the anti-trust law. A great crowd hung around the door, and the attendant who guarded it, and who was generally known as Eagles, had the time of his life keeping out those who had no business with the court. Through the crowd Mr. Choate elbowed his way, and when he got to the door he was held up by Eagles, who said he didn't know him. "I am Joseph H. Choate," said the lawyer, with a twinkle in his eye, "and I assure you I have business in the court."—"I don't know who you vos," replied Eagles, doggedly.—"But I am the president of the Bar Association," persisted Mr. Choate, the smile on his face broadening.—"Ya, ya," returned the attendant, "I heard about dose fellers before already. Steve O'Hare he is the counsel for them what has a bartenders' association. Yes, I know—" Eagles was interrupted by a roar of laughter from the crowd, and Mr. Choate finally got into the court.

In the course of the debate in the House of Commons on the Criminal Appeal Bill on the 31st ult., Mr. Buckmaster, K.C., M.P., said that "the Bill was not applied to Scotland because there was no claim for it from that country, where the judges in the courts of summary jurisdiction were paid men appointed on account of their fitness for the office. He believed it would be found that, where questions were raised with regard to a judgment or sentence, it arose from a weakened confidence in the tribunal. It was no use disguising the fact that the judgment of many of our judges had ceased to command the confidence of the public and of the profession. The reason was plain and the cure might be removed.

Judicial offices from the highest to the lowest had been tossed to this man and to that as a reward for party service, or, still worse, for personal favour. If steps were taken to secure that every man who administered the law was a man fit to administer it, the main cause for this Bill would have disappeared, and there would be removed from the great profession to which he belonged the taint which had always clung to it—the taint of time service."

The twenty-first annual report on the Records of the Corporation of the City of London has just been issued, says the *Times*, and, while being of great interest to antiquaries and historians, it cannot fail to attract the attention of the student of London municipal history. Dr. Sharpe, the Records Clerk to the Corporation, for some years past has been occupied in arranging and calendaring the valuable series of records known as Letter Books, and this year he has completed the calendar of Letter Book H. The calendar covers an extremely interesting period of City history—namely, the reign of Richard II., 1377-1399. At that period the constitution of the Court of Common Council underwent a change, the election of the court being transferred from the wards to the Livery Companies and back again to the wards. The calendar chronicles the fact also that the Court of Aldermen received the attention of Parliament, and it was decreed that thenceforth aldermen should remain in office until removed for a just and reasonable cause. Hitherto, from 1377 to 1394, an alderman was elected annually. This change, created by Parliament, became permanent and remains to the present day. The calendar will shortly be issued to the learned societies and public institutions.

On Tuesday last, in answer to Lord Halsbury, the Lord Chancellor said there was undoubtedly a serious arrear of business in the Law Courts, which he was quite sure ought to be cleared off if the business of the courts of justice was to be efficiently conducted. For that purpose he had brought in a Bill which had passed this House, and was really in the nature of a Bill providing for emergencies. He hoped that Bill might be allowed to become law, and then they might take in hand the clearance of the list in the Court of Appeal. In addition, he had asked a number of distinguished gentlemen to act as a committee to consider the working of the Judicature Acts and report whether any alteration in the constitution or practice of the courts was advisable. Lord Macnaghten had consented to act as chairman, and he himself proposed to serve on the committee. The following had also consented or would be asked to consent: The Lord Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls, the President of the Probate and Admiralty Division, Mr. Justice Bigham, Mr. Justice Warrington, the Attorney-General, Sir Robert Finlay, G.C.M.G., K.C., Mr. J. E. Banks, K.C., Mr. S. A. T. Rowlatt, Mr. Willes Chitty, Mr. C. A. Coward, and Mr. William Cobbett. These gentlemen were all familiar with this subject, and he did not apprehend that much, if any, evidence would be required. He sincerely hoped the efforts of this committee would enable them before long to get the whole of the business of the High Court of Justice placed on such a footing that there would be no delay and no arrears in the management of public business.

An influential meeting was held in the hall of Trinity College, Cambridge, on Saturday last, to promote a memorial to Professor Maitland, late Downing Professor of Law. The Vice-Chancellor presided. Mr. S. H. Butcher, M.P., moved, "That a fund be established, to be called 'The Frederic William Maitland Memorial Fund,' for the promotion of research and instruction in the history of law and of legal language and institutions." He referred to the characteristics of the professor, whom he described as the most human of men. They recalled in the first instance the most delightful companion, but they had to think of him also as a man of learning. What were they to call him—was he historian or lawyer? Neither word seemed to suffice. But history and law had rarely formed so fine an alliance, or nurtured into such fruitful union as in the mind of Maitland. He was of all lawyers the most historical and of all historians the most legal. Professor Dicey seconded the resolution, and declared that Oxford felt the loss of Professor Maitland as keenly as did Cambridge. Law ought to be, and hitherto in England had not been, a part of English literature. Professor Maitland and Blackstone in different ages had done much to accomplish this. Professor Tout, on behalf of Manchester University, expressed sympathy with the proposal. The resolution was carried. The Master of Trinity proposed, and Professor Clark seconded, a resolution, "That, if found practicable, a personal memorial of the late Professor Maitland be obtained and placed in the Squire Library of the University of Cambridge." The resolution was carried. The Bishop of Ely proposed, "That the balance of the fund be offered to the University to be held in trust; and that the University be requested to frame regulations and appoint managers who shall carry out the object of the fund by encouraging research, by promoting the publication of important works, by arranging for occasional lectures or otherwise as they shall deem best." He described the professor as one who was recognized throughout the world as a master among masters. Professor Courtney Kenny seconded the resolution, which was carried. A committee was appointed to carry out the resolutions.

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 31.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ROBSON'S STEAM LAUNDRY, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented May 7, directed to be heard at the Town Hall, Poole, June 17. Salt, Bournemouth, solicitor for petitioner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 16.

BRITISH UNITED CLOCK CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before July 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick George Painter, 19, Coleman St., Liquidator.

ECONOMIC LIGHT CO, J MANDEL & CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before July 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Cecil Harris, 119, Houndsditch, liquidator

FOSTER & AINSLEY, LIMITED—Creditors are required forthwith to send particulars to Hugh F. Percy, Bondgate Within, Alnwick, liquidator

JACKSON, SOULSBY, & COOPER, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 21, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to J. H. Scott, Victoria Chambers, Bowditch Lane, Hull, liquidator

JOHNSON, CLARKE, & PARKER, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J. W. Roberts, Eldon st, liquidator

KILNER CROFT DYING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 12, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick Cooper, 33, Princess st, Manchester Brown & Co, Stockport, solors for liquidator

PRESS AGENCY, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John J. Bye, 120, Bishopsgate st, liquidator

REVERSION INVESTMENT CORPORATION, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before July 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Ralph Price Hardy, 61, Addison rd, Kensington. Fowler & Co, Bedford row, solors for liquidator

R. F. SANDERSON & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 12, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Colin Cooper, 33, Princess st, Manchester. Grundy & Co, Manchester, solors for liquidator

TOWNER & CLARK, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 17, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel Harman, 1, Holland ter, Maidstone. Bracher, Maidstone, solor for liquidator

WINCHESTER GOLD MINING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. William George Barlow, 79, Gracechurch st. Greenip & Co George st, Mansion House, solors for liquidator

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, June 4.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ANGLO-FRENCH HERALD MOTOR CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Thomson, 65, London wall, liquidator

BIASFALIC CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Richard Leyhohn, 12, Mount Stuart sq, Cardiff, liquidator

BLACKLEY DYING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Percy Staton, 64, Fountain st, Manchester, liquidator

BOYD ASHWORTH & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Percy Staton, 64, Fountain st, Manchester, liquidator

DENNIS & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 17, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to C. M. Ayliffe, 10, Commercial st, Newport, Mon, liquidator

EDWIN J. BERT, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented May 30, directed to be heard on June 18. Hickson & Moir, New Broad st, solors for petn. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 17

ESPLANADE HOTEL (PORTHCAUL) CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented May 31, directed to be heard June 18. Spencer & Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury sq, solors for petn. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 17

GROSVENOR SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 18, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Charles Bound, 57, Moorgate st, liquidator

J. PARKER & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 28, to send in their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to John George Hirst, 125, Albion st, Leeds, liquidator

J. WILKINSON & J. D. LYCHE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Benjamin Howorth, 26, North John st, Liverpool. Collins & Co, Liverpool, solors for liquidator

LANCASHIRE VAUDEVILLE SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 1, directed to be heard June 18. Oppenheim & Son, solors for petn. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 17

LYLA CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederic Harold Sully, 19 and 21, Queen Victoria st. Ward & Co, Gracechurch st, solors for liquidator

MUNICHSON ASSOCIATED GOLD MINES, LIMITED (INCORPORATED IN 1901)—Creditors are required, on or before July 9, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Fenton Pugh, 3, Queen st, Cheshire. Parker & Co, St Michael's Rectory, Cornhill, solors for the liquidator

S J MACKENZIE & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to C G Morgan Timbrell & Deighton, King William st, London Bridge, solors for liquidator

SURETY SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 30, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Henry Fox, 9, Austin Friars, liquidator

TRADING AND MANUFACTURING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederic Harold Sully, 19 and 21, Queen Victoria st. Ward & Co, Gracechurch st, solors for liquidator

VICTORIA AND ALBERT BRICK, TILE, AND EARTHENWARE CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 3, directed to be heard June 18. Wynne & Sons, 3, New ct, Lincoln's inn, for Forshaw & Hawkins, Liverpool, solors for petn. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 17

The Property Mart.

Result of Sales.

REVERSIONS, LIFE POLICIES, & CO.

Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD held their usual Fortnightly Sale of the above-named interests at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on Thursday last, when the following lots were sold at the prices named, the total amount realized being £30,230:—

ABSOLUTE REVERSIONS:	£
To One-fifth of Freeholds	500
To £22,100	24,525
To One-third of 100-143rds of £10,967	900
To £1,000	400
To £1,521	685
To £200	360
To £1,300	875
POLICIES OF ASSURANCE for £3,000	1,215
REDEMPTION POLICY for £3,000...	1,080

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

Date.	ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON			
	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	MR. JUSTICE KEKEWICH.	MR. JUSTICE JOYCE.
Monday, June	10 Mr. Borer	Mr. Carrington	Mr. Bloxam	Mr. Theod. Goldschmidt
Tuesday	11 Bloxam	Pemberton	Borer	Goldschmidt
Wednesday	12 Goldschmidt	Carrington	Bloxam	Theod. Goldschmidt
Thursday	13 Theod. Goldschmidt	Pemberton	Borer	Theod. Goldschmidt
Friday	14 Groswell	Carrington	Bloxam	Theod. Goldschmidt
Saturday	15 Leach	Pemberton	Borer	Goldschmidt
Date	MR. JUSTICE SWINFEN EADY. WARRINGTON.			
	MR. JUSTICE KEKEWICH.	MR. JUSTICE NEVILLE.	MR. JUSTICE PARKES.	MR. JUSTICE JOYCE.
Monday, June	10 Mr. King	Mr. Leach	Mr. Farmer	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday	11 Church	Groswell	Beal	Carrington
Wednesday	12 King	Leach	Farmer	Beal
Thursday	13 Church	Groswell	Beal	Farmer
Friday	14 King	Leach	Farmer	Church
Saturday	15 Church	Groswell	Beal	King

COURT OF APPEAL.

TRINITY SITTINGS, 1907.

The Appeals or other Business proposed to be taken will, from time to time, be announced in the Daily Cause List.

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

(In Appeal Court II.)

(General List.)

Judgment Reserved.

Hill v Clifford appl of plff from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 19, 1907 (c a v May 15)

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

(General List.)

1905.

In the Matter of the Cos Acts, 1862 to 1900, and in the Matter of Thomas Sowler & Sons lid appl of P G Andrews from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Aug 3, 1905 (produce order) (s o for appointment of legal personal representative) Aug 21

1906

In re J F Boswell, dec Merritt v Boswell appl of M S Emerson from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 30, 1906 (s o for appln to Joyce, J) Feb 16

The Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Bournemouth and The Mayor, & Co, of Poole and The Urban District Council of Bournemouth v The Poole District Electric Traction Co lid appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated March 5, 1906 June 1 (s o until Mr Justice Joyce has given his decision upon points of fact on in this action by order of the Court of Appeal, April 9, 1907)

In re Hutchinson, dec Rome v Rome appl of plff from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated March 26, 1906 (s o until reference disposed of) July 16

Buchler v Inch and anr appl of plff from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated June 21, 1906 (s o until action disposed of by Neville, J) Oct 1

Shepherd and ors v Bray and ors appl of defts (Bray's Executors) from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated July 17, 1906 Nov 9

Shepherd and ors v Bray and ors appl of defts (Gaunt's Executors) from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated July 17, 1906, and cross-notice by plffs, dated Nov 13, 1906 Nov 9

Neave v B N C lid and ors Bohn v Neave and ors appl of E Bohn from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Nov 23, 1906 (produce order, security ordered) Dec 15

In re Beyfus & Beyfus, Solicitors of the Supreme Court appl of A and P Beyfus from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Oct 29, 1906 Dec 22

Martin v The Consett Iron Co lid appl of plff from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Nov 17, 1906 Dec 31

1907

In re John Edwards, dec Edwards v Edwards appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 20, 1906 Jan 1

In re Mary Maughan, dec Bernard v Fawcett appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Nov 7, 1906 Jan 16

National Phonograph Co lid v Edison Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co lid and ors appl of plff company from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Dec 15, 1906 Jan 25

Attorney-Gen v Mathieson appl of Attorney-Gen from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 11, 1906 (s o for Attorney-Gen) Jan 2

In re Wilkinson and Fell's Contract and In re Vendor and Purchaser Ad 1874 appl of purchaser C H Fell from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 11, 1906 (to follow above by order) Jan 31

In re Smith's Settlement Jacob Smith and anr v Smith and ors appl of defts from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Jan 30, 1907 Feb 25

In re William Wilson, dec Wilson and ors v Batchelor and ors appl of plffs from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated Feb 7, 1907 Feb 26

Beston v Watts appl of deft from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 21, 1907 Feb 26

Lloyds v The Marconi International Marine Communication Co ld and anr appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 15, 1907 Feb 27

In re Meynell Ingram, dec Corry v Wood and ors appl of debt the Hon F G L Meynell from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 4, 1906 March 1

Dibdin v Skirrow appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated Jan 24, 1907 March 1

Rees v Owen appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 9, 1907 March 5

In re Davy, dec Hollingsworth v Davy and ors appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Jan 24, 1907 March 9

Brett (Widow) and ors v Tweedie and ors appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated Jan 30, 1907 March 13

In re Brinckman's Settled Estates and In re The Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1900 appl of Sir T F Brinckman, Bart, from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Feb 7, 1907 March 16

The Lincoln Equitable Co-operative Soc, ld v The Tannery, Lincoln, Co, ld appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Dec 13, 1907 March 19

In re Richard Miller's Will Jones and ors v Hawkins and anr appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Feb 27, 1907 March 19

In re Thomas Corbett, dec Viscount Cobham v The Attorney-General appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 4, 1906 March 20

Howatson v Webb Webb v Howatson and ors appl of debt Webb from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 22, 1907 March 21

Clark v Clark appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated March 4, 1907 March 21

Woods v Weir appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated March 7, 1907 March 22

In the Matter of the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1888, and in the Matter of Letters Patent No. 1434* of the year 1899, granted to S G Brown appl of petnrs from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated March 11, 1907 March 23

Draper v Lorden and H Sabey & Co appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Feb 18, 1907 (produce order, security ordered) March 27

James v The Insatute of Chartered Accountants appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 1, 1907 March 27

HM Postmaster-General v The National Telephone Co ld appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated March 20, 1907 (produce order) March 28

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900 and In re The Camena Nitrate Co ld (in liquidation) appl of applicant from order of Mr Justice Parker, dated March 12, 1907 April 10

Copestake v Hoper (widow) and anr appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 8, 1907 April 15

In re Waterhouse, dec Waterhouse v Ryley appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Joyce, dated Feb 20, 1907 (produce order) April 15

Corsellis v London County Council appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated March 11, 1907 April 15

H M Attorney-General v Jefferys and ors appl of debt Jefferys from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated Dec 18, 1906 April 16

In re Hazeldine's Trusts and in re Trustee Act, 1893 appl of appls from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated April 9, 1907 (produce order) April 19

In re Llanover Herbert v Ram appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated March 27, 1907 April 24

The Edison Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co ld v The National Phonograph Co ld appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated March 25, 1907 April 25

Lowen v Gare appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 20, 1907 April 28

Ball v Friend appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 24, 1907 (produce order) May 1

Clifford v Timms appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Jan 26, 1907 (advanced for May 28) May 3 Clifford v Phillips appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Jan 26, 1907 May 3

In re Salaman, dec De Pass v Sonnenthal appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 16, 1907 May 7

In the Matter of an Indenture of Lease, dated Dec 10, 1903 Isaacs v Stansfield & Co ld appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated April 10, 1907 May 7

Jones v Thomas appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated April 24, 1907 May 7

In re Margaret Cook, dec In re Penny, dec Evans v Holmes appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated April 12, 1907 May 8

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900 In re The Life Assce Acts, 1870 and 1872 and In re Nelson & Co ld appl of The Nelson Syndicate from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated April 23, 1907 May 10

Thompson v Yorton appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated April 12, 1907 May 10

In re H E Attwater, dec Bridgman v Milner appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady, dated March 21, 1907 May 13

Pemsel v Tucker appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated May 10, 1907 (produce order) May 16

The Attorney-General and ors v Metcalf & Greig and ors appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 24, 1907 May 18

FROM THE CHANCERY AND PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

1907.

Pearce v Bullard, King & Co appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 25, 1907 May 11

Bosch v Simms' Manufacturing Co ld appl of debts from order of Mr Justice Neville, dated May 10, 1907 (produce order) May 14

Sherwell v The Combined Incandescent Mantles Syndicate ld and ors appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Warrington, dated April 26, 1907 (produce order) May 15

Probate Division In re Mann, dec Mann v Lyne and ors appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated May 6, 1907 May 17

FROM THE PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(Final List.)

1906.

Probate Drake v Sykes appl of plttf from judgt of The President, dated July 26, 1906, jury discharged, Middlesex Oct 26

Divorce Francis Stewart Henry Todd (Petnr) v Charlotte Elizabeth Rose Francis Todd (Respt) William Cunniam (Co-Respt) appl of petnr from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Oct 26, 1906 Nov 1

1907.

Divorce Sarah Helen Ogden (Applt) v William Henry Ogden (Respt) appl of applt from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Dec 10, 1906 Feb 14

(New Trial Paper.)

1906.

Probate In re The Estate of John Hedley, dec William Wainwright and Edmund David White v John Herbert Hedley appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Aug 1, 1906, with a jury, Liverpool Nov 15

FROM THE COUNTY PALATINE COURT OF LANCASTER.

(Final List.)

1907.

Lomas v Challinor appl of debt from order of The Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dated March 10, 1907 April 3

(Interlocutory List.)

1907.

Slack and ors v Calico Printers' Assoc ld appl of debts from order of The Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, dated Feb 11, 1907 (so liberty to apply to restore) Feb 22

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(In Bankruptcy.)

In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No. 51 of 1906 from an Order of the Divisional Court (Bigham and Sutton, JJ.), dated 22nd March, 1907, dismissing with costs the Debtor's appeal from a Receiving Order

In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No. 288 of 1907 from a Receiving Order made on the 25th of April, 1907, by Mr Registrar Linklater

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Hearing.

(Final List.)

1905.

London and North Western Ry Co (Applt) v The Assessment Committee of the Amptill Union and ors (respte) appl of respte from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrence and Ridley, dated Dec 15, 1905 Jan 11 (part heard before Vaughan Williams, Farwell and Buckley, L.J.J.—restored April 8, 1907)

Rumball v Bunting appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated March 11, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex (so for appointment of legal representative) April 12

1906.

Lennard v Kent and East Sussex Light Ry Co appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Jan 31, 1906 (jury discharged), Middlesex (so not before Aug 13, 1907) April 28

Hore v Day appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Buckley (additional judge), dated May 10, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 19

Taylor v Mayor, &c, of Maidenhead appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Buckley (additional judge), dated May 12, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 21

Housley and anr v Prosser appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated April 3, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 16

Smith v Prosser appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated May 7, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex May 23

Beer v Bell (wife sued in respect of her separate estate) appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, dated May 19, 1906, with a special jury, Middlesex May 26

In the Matter of the Arbitration Act, 1889 between Coleman's Depositories ld and The Life and Health Assce Assoc appl of Life and Health Assce Assoc from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated May 4, 1906 May 26

Lancaster Rural District Council v Fisher & Le Fanu appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated May 16, 1906, without a jury, West Derby Division of the County of Lancaster (not before June 6) May 16

Pacific Steam Navigation Co v Pugh & Son appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated May 15, 1906, without a jury, West Derby Division of the County of Lancaster, and cross-notice by pliffs, dated May 30, 1906 (not before June 3) May 30

In re Arbitration Act, 1889 Max Thomas and Holstrom & Co appl of Max Thomas from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 21, 1906 June 13

Wheatley v Smithers and anr appl of pliff from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 24, 1906 June 20

London and India Docks Co v Thames Steam Tug and Lighterage Co appl of pliffs from judgt of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated June 12, 1906, and cross-notice by debts, dated July 21, 1906 June 30

Evans v Hobbs appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated June 20, 1906, with a common jury, Reading (Berks) July 3

Lancashire and Cheshire Coal Assoc and R Evans & Co ld v London and North Western Ry Co and Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, Sir F Peel, and The Hon A E Gathorne Hardy, dated June 21, 1906 July 3

Oceanic Steam Ship Co v Faber appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated May 1, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 4

London Salt Co ld v T S Harris & Co ld appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated June 19, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 9

Sharp v Bates appl of debt from judgt of Justices Darling and Ridley, dated May 25, 1906 July 9

Shaw v Spiers appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Swinfen Eady (additional judge), dated June 20, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 10

In re Taxation of Costs and In re H R Newson, gentleman, &c appl of Newson from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated June 21, 1906 (security ordered) July 12

The Bede SS Co ld v The Bangan Syndikat G M B H of Berlin appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated June 23, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 14

Automobile Review ld v Lamb Bros & Garnett appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated June 1, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 16

Horsley & Floyd v Edwards, Rumpier & Co and ors appl of debts Puddy & Hale ld from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated May 21, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 24

In the Matter of an Arbitration between W F B Eadon and the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the City of Bristol appl of the Lord Mayor, &c, of Bristol from order of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated July 17, 1906 (special case) July 25 John Gibbs v Same July 25 Charles A Newman v Same July 25 R H Carpenter and ors v Same July 25 (transferred to Final List, Aug 6, 1906)

Grose-Smith v The Isle of Wight Ry Co appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Buckley (additional judge), dated May 5, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex July 26

Manwaring v Jennings appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated July 17, 1906 July 27

In re The Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1883 to 1900, and In re an Arbitration between O E Jennings and E J Manwaring appl of O E Jennings from judgt of His Honour Judge Emden dated July 13, 1906 (special case), Tunbridge Wells July 27

1907

In re an Arbitration between Jennings and Manwaring appl of Jennings from judgt of Justices Darling and Bray, dated Dec 20, 1906 Jan 7

1906

In re Arbitration Act, 1889 The Laundry Employers, &c, Co ld v The Accident Insee Co ld appl of Accident Insee Co from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated July 24, 1906 (special case) Aug 1

Martyn v Cowell and anr appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 21, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 2

The Premier Boiler Tubes ld v Hargreaves appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated July 20, 1906, without a jury, Manchester Aug 3

The Mayor &c, of the Borough of Chorley v Nightingale appl of pliff from judgt of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated July 19, 1906 Aug 3

The Morrison Shipping Co ld v Drefus & Co appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 26, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 3

Macbeth v The North and South Wales Bank ld appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated June 30, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 4

Mayor, &c, of West Bromwich v Martin appl of debt from judgt of Justices Kennedy and A T Lawrence, dated May 10, 1906 Aug 4

Frost (Spinster) v Douglas (Widow) appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated July 31, 1906, with a special jury, Middlesex Aug 8

Wilkinson v Walthamstow District Council and anr appl of pliff from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated May 15, 1906 Aug 9

Fear v Phillips appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated July 30, 1906, without a jury, Cardiganshire Aug 10

Attorney-General v London and India Docks Co (Revenue Side) appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Aug 3, 1906 Aug 10

Gent v Gent appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Commissioner Pickford, KC, dated July 27, 1906, and a common jury, Durham Aug 11

Gent v Gent appl of debt from judgt of Mr Commr Pickford, KC, and a common jury, Durham (advanced by order) Sept 6

Attorney-General v The Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Ry (Revenue Side) appl of Attorney-General from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated July 27, 1906 Aug 13

Smith & Co v Traill appl of debt from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 8, 1906 Aug 11

Salt Union ld v Brunner, Mond, & Co ld appl of pliffs from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated Aug 10, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 16

Adams v The Marylebone Boro Council appl of pliff from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 9, 1906 Aug 17

Leadbitter and ors v Marylebone Boro Council appl of pliffs from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 9, 1906 Aug 17

J M Irvine (trading, &c) v North and South Wales Bank ld appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Aug 8, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 18

Charles Wells v Tom Hughes (District Loan Co, clmts) appl of pliffs from judgt of Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Aug 10, 1906 Aug 20

Richardson and ors v Graham ld appl of debts from judgt of Mr Commr Pickford, KC, dated Aug 3, 1906 (special jury), Durham Aug 20

J Altman v The Drovers' Benevolent Institution appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Aug 10, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 21

(To be continued.)

Creditors' Notices.

Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 17.

HEDLEY, JOHN, Liverpool June 25 White v Hedley, Swinfen Eady, J Driffeld, Liverpool

SHARPLES, ELIZABETH, St Annes on the Sea June 14 Baron v Butler, Registrar, Preston

SHAPE, JOHN, Ashfurloog, Pontypridd June 17 Morgan Crucible Co, Limited v Snape, Parker, J Snape, Maesteg, Glam

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 24.

CROSS, WILLIAM, Southport June 24 Cross v Ball, Registrar, Liverpool Mather, Liverpool

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 31.

JAMES, WALTER THOMAS, Newport, I of W Hotel Proprietor June 29 James v James Judge in Chambers, Room No 639, Royal Courts of Justice Hickson & Moir, New Broad st

POINTON, THOMAS, Gatara, Bridgnorth June 28 Roden v Pointon, Judge in Chambers, Room No 283, Royal Courts of Justice Phillips, Shifnal, Salop

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, June 4.

BOSLEY, EDWIN EDWARD, Hereford June 19 Hooley v Case, Neville, J Carless, Hereford

BRUCE, HELEN, West Cromwell rd, Kensington July 2 Heathorn v Bruce, Parker, J Bull, Old Jewry

HANSON, ELIZABETH, Scarborough June 25 Rhodes v Hanson, Parker, J Watson, Middlesbrough

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 17.

ANDERSON, MARGARET, Kemp Town, Brighton June 29 Collins & Collins, King William st, London Bridge

ARMSTRONG, ANNA MARIA, Poole, Dorset June 15 Bawtree & Sons, Witham, Essex

AXFORD, MARTHA, Gordon rd, Ealing July 8 Harman, Cleman st

BALDWIN, HENRY, Rayleigh, Essex Builder June 18 Cooper, southend on Sea

BARTLETT, THOMAS EDWARD, Bath July 5 Simmonds & Co, Bath

BRIDGE, ART MARIA, Huntingdon June 29 Margate, Huntingdon

BROCKMAN, CHRISTIAN CARL WILHELM ERNST, Gloucester rd, Finsbury Park, Commission Merchant June 29 Mann & Crimp, Essex st, Strand

BUSHILL, ELIZABETH, Swaunge June 14 Rawlins & Rawlins, Burnsmouth

CONNELL, MARGARET ANWLY, Whitley Bay, Northumberland June 29 Dickinson & Co, Newcastle upon Tyne

COOPER, GEORGE, Tideswell, Derby July 1 Benson & Co, Sheffield

COSBEN, FRANCH WILLIAM, Cleveland sq, Hyde Park July 15 Timplin & Co, Fenchurch st

CRISP, ADELINE JAMES, Sech, Norfolk, Innkeeper May 31 Partridge & Co, King's Lynn

DATY, Right Hon HORACE Baron, Fenchurch, Sussex June 15 Meredith & Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn

DENT, WILLIAM STANLEY, Streatham hill May 31 Smethman, Hemel Hempstead, Herts

EATON, GEORGE MOLLEWORTH, Moseley, Worcester, Insurance Broker June 20 Buller & Cross, Birmingham

ELLIS, MARY ANN DOROTHY, Lewes May 31 Lewis & Holman, Lewes

ETHEL, SARAH, York June 19 Clifton & Co, Nottingham

ESKANE, AGNE, Crown Office row, Temple, Merchant June 15 Browne, Clement's in

GEORGE, SARAH ANN, Folsingham, Lincs, Miller June 24 Smith & Co, Horbling

GRINDLE, HENRY THOMAS, Sheffield, Cutlery Manufacturer June 14 Fry-Smith & Barker, Sheffield

HARBORD, HARBORD, Eastbourne June 24 White & Leonard, Ludgate circus

HARTBIDGE, SUSANNA, Ipswich June 3 Josselyn & Sons, Ipswich

HEATON, ROBERT, Cooker Bar, Leyland, Lancs, Labourer May 31 Catterall & Livesey, Preston

HIMSWORTH, ELLEN, Wakefield June 30 Harrison & Co, Wakefield

ISAACSON, ALBERT EDWARD, Johnson st, Notting Hill July 4 Oswald & Co, Hammer-smith rd, West Kensington

KELLAND, ALEXANDRINA JANEETTA DONALDSON, Westwell rd, Streatham July Robinson & Stannard, Eastcheap

LANE, ANN ELIZABETH, Southsea, Hants June 23 Allen, Portsmouth

LARGE, HERMAN HESSE, Highbury Newpt June 29 Wrang, Devonshire sq, Bishopsgate

LYDD, ANNE JULIA, West Kensington gds June 25 Keeney & Co, Clement's inn, Strand

LONDON, JAMES, Sheffield, Contractor June 24 Ludlam, Sheffield

LYON, WILLIAM, Manchester, Artificial Flowers Manufacturer April 20 Milner, Leeds

MCBRIDE, SARAH, Gt Chelms June 15 Robinson & Son, Lincoln's inn fields

MAJOR, The Hon ANNE HELEN HENRIKSE, Berkeley st, Piccadilly June 25 Kennedy & Co, Clement's inn, Strand

MOTE, JAMES, Queen st June 17 Mote & Son, Queen st

NEWMAN, HENRY, North Shields, Blacksmith June 17 Mcbane & Co, South Shields

NEWTON, CAROLINE, Slough June 29 Shepards & Walters, Finsbury circus

NICHOLLS, RICHARD, Stoke upon Trent, Staffs, Timber Merchant June 17 Marshall & Co, Stoke upon Trent

NUSSER, Mrs J C COBBLES BULKLEY, Duke st mans, Grosvenor sq June 18 Brown, Lincoln's inn fields

PARKINSON, FREDERICK, Bournemouth May 31 D'Angiban & Malin, Boscombe

ROBERTSON, JAMES ALEXANDER, Cape Town, Cape of Good Hope July 15 East, Basinghall st
ROBERTSON, WILLIAM BUXTON, Bournemouth June 22 Fox, Railway app, London Bridge
BOWE, JOHN ARCHIBALD, Montreal, Canada June 18 Gill & Co, Liverpool
SCHROEDER, GEORGE ARTHUR, South Woodford, Essex, Bookkeeper June 30 Carr & Co, Wood in, Finchurch st
SHEFFIELD, GEORGE HENRY, Nottingham, Corn Factor June 22 Samuel Morley, Hounds gate, Nottingham
SMITH, FREDERICK, Putney July 1 Sexton & Morgan, Somerset st, Portman sq
TAYLOR, ANN FRANKS, Ventnor, I of W July 1 Langhams, Bartlett's bldg, Holborn circus
THOMAS, LOUISA ELIZABETH, Stoke, Devonport June 28 Owen, Liverpool
THORP, PROFESSOR CHARLES, Museum st, Bloomsbury June 17 Sandon & Co, Deptford
WADDINGTON, WILLIAM ARNOLD, Knutsford, Chester June 29 Cooper & Sons, Manchester
WATT, HENRY, Sheffield June 30 Irons, Sheffield
WALTERS, THOMAS, Rensleigh st June 30 J H & K R Cobb, Lincoln's inn fields
WALTON, JOHN, Styl, nr Handforth, Chester June 13 Stott, Manchester
WHITE, ALEXANDER, Norristown, Montgomery, Pennsylvania, USA June 18 Hewitt & Co, Leadenhall st
WHITWAY, ROBERT CHRYSTIE, Brighton May 31 Godfree, Brighton
WILLIAMS, HENRY WHITEHEAD, Solva, Pembroke, Newspaper Proprietor June 10 Williams, Haverfordwest
WILLIS, JOSEPH, Ashton upon Lyne, Lancs June 18 Hamer, Ashton upon Lyne
WILSON, JAMES, Blackpool, Boarding House Keeper June 6 Gaultier, Fleetwood
WOOD, ERNEST REUBEN, Birkenhead, Chester June 15 Batesons & Co, Liverpool
WOOD, ISABELLA ROSA, Witham, Essex June 15 Rawtree & Sons, Wlham
WOODCOCK, JAMES, York June 28 Shaftoe, York
WORTHINGTON, GEORGE, Liverpool, Contractor June 17 Watson & Atkinson, Liverpool

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 21.

ANDERSON, JAMES GEORGE SKELTON, Finchurch av, Shipowner June 21 Parker & Co, St Michael's Rectory, Cornhill
BOWEN, JEMIMA, Further Barton, Gloucester June 17 Haygarth, Gloucester
BROOKER, FRANK, Tunbridge Wells, Mason July 1 Cover, Tunbridge Wells
COOPER, HENRY, Macerough, York, Accountant June 30 Irons, Sheffield
DAVIDSON, ELIZABETH, Ipswich July 1 Jackman & Co, Ipswich
DUGDALE, JAMES, Ashton, nr Preston June 15 J T Eas'ham, Clitheroe
FARQUHAR, JAMES, Kincardine, NB June 29 Sladen & Wing, Delahay st, Westminster
FARRELL, EDWIN, Moira, Leicester July 1 Smith & Co, Ashby de la Zouch
FITZGERALD, ELIZA, Southampton June 30 Stephens & Locke, Southampton
FITZPATRICK, ANN, Manchester, Wholesale Milliner May 31 Watson & Booth, Manchester
GREEN, SARAH ANN, Broadwood, Staffs June 24 Martin, Wolverhampton
HARRIS, ELIZA ANN DE WITT, Bea Rhidding, Yorks June 13 C W Cykes, Elistow, Halifax
HIGGINS, THOMAS, Manchester, Warper June 15 Dyke, Duchy of Lancaster Office
HINDLE, JOHN, Cark in Cartmel, Lancs, Printer June 10 Martin & Atkinson, Ulverston
HOLBOROW, ALFRED JOHN, Bristol, Commercial Traveller June 23 Inskip & son, Bristol
LIVERPOOL, Right Hon GEORGE GEORGE SAVILE Earl of, Kirkham Abbey, Yorks June 30 Dawson & Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn
MCALL, ELIZABETH SIDDALL, Paris June 21 Reid, Castle ct, Birchin In
MARSHALL, SUSAN FRANCES, Maidenhead June 15 Brooks & Co, Doctors Commons
MARTIN, HENRIETTA, Cathays, Cardiff June 30 Cousins & Co, Cardiff
MOOR, WILLIAM JOHN, Dovercourt, Essex June 15 Ward & Hugh-Jones, Harwich
MURKETT, GEORGE THOMAS, Arnis rd, S Hackney June 16 Crocker, Finsbury pavement
NIXON, ROBERT, Bradford June 10 Sharpe, Bradford
PARSONS, JAMES ROBERT, Plaistow, Essex, Coal Merchant June 11 Holder & Wood, Chesham
PHILLIPS, JOHN, Clydach Vale, Glam, Contractor June 8 Pugh & Davey, Pontypridd
PIKE, CHARLES, Handover gids, Kensington June 29 Dallimore & Son, Camberwell New rd
PIPE, HANNAH ELIZABETH, Limsfield June 15 Leonard & Pilditch, Bishopsgate
ROBINSON, ROY JOHN WILLIAM, Chard, Somerset June 23 Adler & Perowne, Cophall av
RUSSELL, HENRY JOHN FREDERICK, Belvedere rd, Upper Norwood June 30 Emmet & Co, Bloomsbury sq
RUSSELL, MARY JEFFRIES, Newbury, Berks July 27 Burges & Sloan, Bristol
SALMON, JOSEPH SMITH, Reading June 24 Brain & Brain, Reading
SAWTELL, HELEN, Ealing June 30 Hobbs & Young, Brighton
SAWYER, MARY WALKER, Plymouth July 17 Booker & Co, Plymouth
SEAW, ALFRED, Gedling, Notts, Cricket Outfitter June 15 Fraser & Son, Nottingham
SMITH, HASKETT, Bath June 20 Burton & Co, Surrey st, Strand
SPRAIGER, EDWARD MARTIN, Liverpool June 6 Johnson & Son, Liverpool
STREETER, ALFRED, New Malden, Surrey June 24 Percy Stroud Streeter, Malden College, New Malden, Surrey
WINSTANLEY, WILLIAM, Newcastle under Lyme, Gasworks Manager June 24 Till, Newcastle, Staffs
WOODWARD, HORWOOD WILLIAM, Aylesbury, Baker June 18 Horwood & James, Aylesbury

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 24.

ANTHON, EDWARD, Manhattan, New York June 21 Jobson, Lincoln's inn fields
ATKINSON, SOPHIA, Malvern, Worcester June 22 Milne & Milne, Clement's inn
BURNING, JOSEPH, Loughborough park, Brixton July 8 Farrar & Co, Wardrobe pl, Doctors Common
BUTCHER, MARY ANN, Aldeburgh, Suffolk June 24 Mayhew & Sons, Saxmundham
CHALKIN, FREDERICK GEORGE WILLIAM, Weston super Mare June 30 Bowen, Pontypool
CHALKIN, SUSANNA DURAND SICKLEMORE, Weston super Mare June 30 Bowen, Pontypool
COOPER, SOPHIA GERTRUDE PASTON, Oakham, Rutland June 30 Crawley & Co, Arlington st, St James's
COUTTHART, ELIZABETH, Morland, Westmorland June 30 Richardson, Penrith
CROSS, FRANCES EMELINE, Brooklyn, New York June 21 Jobson, Lincoln's inn fields
DAVIS, HOWELL, Rotherfield Greys, Henley on Thames June 24 Hanbury & Co, New Broad st
DENT, JAMES, St John's Wood rd June 21 Watkin-Williams & Co, New Broad st
DUPLIS, HARRY, St Levan, Cornwall June 24 Blyth & Co, Gresham House, Old Broad st
DUDLEY, LOUISA, Nottingham Aug 18 Thompson & Sons, Grantham
EATON, ELIZABETH, Nottingham July 31 Pierce, Nottingham
FAIRY, EDWARD HENRY, Rl, Pembridge sq, Baywater June 24 Fahey, Bedford row
GARDNER, THOMAS, Torquay June 30 Seabroke & Son, Rugby
GARLICK, THOMAS, Crawley July 1 Evans & Co, John st, Bedford row
GREENE, REBECCA ANDREWS, Dartmouth, Bristol, Massachusetts, USA June 21 Jobson, Lincoln's inn fields
HOLDEN, ELIZA, Hampthwaite Hollings, Yorks June 23 Kirby & Son, Hartgate
HOOPER, CHARLES THOMAS, Brighton June 22 J & C Hayward, Dartford
KILNEY, ALFRED, Market Weighton, Yorks, Farmer July 6 Robson, Pocklington
LEWIS, WILLIAM EDWARD, Orchard st, Portman sq, Hairdresser June 30 Angell & Co, Gresham st
LILLIGRAP, JOHN, Plymouth July 22 Rooker & Co, Plymouth
MADDERN, CHARITY, Mousehole, Paul, Cornwall June 21 Thomas, Penzance
PRATT, WILLIAM LEA, Pontnewynydd, Mon Aug 1 Bythway & Son, Pontypool
PRIESTLY, FRANCES ELLIN, Charlton, Somerset June 18 Bishop, Bridgwater
RIPLEY, WILLIAM, Leeds June 17 Emmsley & Co, Leeds
ROBERT, WILLIAM JOHN, Leander rd, Brixton hill July 15 Young & Sons, Mark Is
SANDWELL, HENRY, Long In, Bermondsey, Livery Stable Keeper June 23 Myers, Wormwood st, Old Broad st
SETON, BENJAMIN WILLIAM, Stockbridge, Hants June 24 Reynolds & Co, Bedford row
STEELE, GEORGE EDWARD, Shootup Hill, Brondesbury June 30 Graham, Hanover sq
STEVENS, GEORGE, Busby pl, Camden rd July 1 Beyer & Cadell, Clifford's inn
STRANGE, WILLIAM HEATH, Belmore av, Hampstead, Doctor July 1 Marshall & Pridham, Theobald's rd, Gray's inn

SYMONS, CHARLES, Barnstable, Timber Merchant June 14 Harding & Son, Barnstable
THOMSON, JOHN, Tunbridge Wells July 19 Andrew & Chale, Tunbridge Wells
WEEKS, WILLIAM, Easton, Southampton June 30 Burley, Petersfield
WHEATLEY, FREDERICK, Leaves Green, Keaton, Kent June 25 Bird & Bird, Gray's inn sq
WILKINSON, THOMAS, Fulham rd June 24 Dabbs & Son, Bartlett's bldg, Holborn circus
YERKES, CHARLES TYSON, Chicago, U S A, Railway Manager June 24 Perks
YOUNG, REV FREDERICK, Bournemouth July 1 Marshall & Pridham, Theobald's rd, Gray's inn

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 26.

ALEXANDER, ELIZABETH, Bournemouth July 9 Bone, Bournemouth
BARBER, JOHN BURELL, Moorlands Stud Farm, nr York June 30 Edmondson & Goward, Ripon
BARTON, MARTHA CATHARINE, Catford June 29 Robinson & Stannard, Eastcheap
BEAUMONT, EDGAR, Clacton on Sea June 30 Stevens, Clacton on Sea
BROOKHURST, LEAH, Coborn rd, Bow June 29 Harris, Leadenhall st
CATTELL, ELIZABETH, Thoburn Heath July 2 Jones, Arundel st, Strand
CLARE, ELIZABETH, Birkdale June 30 Weightman & Co, Liverpool
CLIFF, WILLIAM HENRY, Truro, Carrier June 30 Hancock, Truro
COLLIER, JAMES WALTER, Sutton, Northampton, Farmer June 28 Fairfax, Banbury
COOKE, HENRY, Catton, Norfolk July 1 Purdy, Aylsham
COOKE, RACHEL MARGARET, Catton, Norfolk July 1 Purdy, Aylsham
COWIE, LAWRENCE STUART, East Stonehouse, Devon June 23 Rodd, East Stonehouse
DEES, CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH, Wallsend, Northumberland July 5 Dees & Thompson, Newcastle upon Tyne
FERGUSON, ALFRED THOMAS, Toronto, Canada July 1 Icard, Moore's st
GLASGOW, MARY JANE, Chesham, Bucks June 30 Francis & How, Chesham
HAMPTON, HELEN, Southampton July 3 Hallett & Martin, Southampton
HIRST, ARTHUR, Dewsbury, Electrical Engineer July 24 Hirst, Dewsbury
HOBBS, THOMAS, North Wharf rd, Paddington, Contractor June 21 Oliver & Co, Warwick st
HOLLANDER, DAVID, Edgbaston, Birmingham, Export Merchant June 15 Hollander
HOLLIST, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Montserrat rd, Putney June 24 Welman & Sons, Westbourne grove
JACKSON, EDWARD HUGH, Wisbech St Peter, Cambridge, Solicitor July 15 Jackson, Wisbech, Cambridge
JOHNSON, MATTHEW FREDERICK, Sheffield, Fruit Dealer's Assistant June 24 Smith & Co, Sheffield
JONES, HUGH, Glanadda, Bangor, Builder June 30 Hughes-Pritchard & Fryce, Bangor
KINGHAM, WILLIAM, Dinton, Aylesbury July 1 Horwood & James, Aylesbury
LAITHWAITE, MARY ANN, Birkdale, Southport June 30 Tickle, St Helen's
LANGTON, JOHN, Morton Swinderby, Lincs, Farmer July 15 Turner & Co, Nottingham
MARSHALL, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Master Mariner July 30 Rollett & Sons, Hull
MILLWOOD, JOHN THOMAS, Gt Dover st, Borough June 24 Hicklin & Co, Trinity sq, Southwark
NEWMAN, MARY, Bath July 8 Simmons & Co, Bath
OADE, WILLIAM THOMAS, Epping June 22 Wilkinson, Bermondsey st
PARKER, ELIZABETH RACHEL ROSALIE DOROTHY, Buxton, Norwich July 19 Barton & Son, Gray's inn pl, Gray's inn
PETROVITCH, SPASOIE, Gt Titchfield st, Gt Portland st, Cabinet Maker June 30 Rubinstein & Co, Raymond bldg, Gray's inn
PROSSER, JOHN, Fastgwyn, Merthyr Cynog, Brecon July 1 D W E & M F Thomas, Brecon
RIPLEY, RICHARD, Liverpool July 1 Nicholson & Pemberton, Liverpool
ROBERTS, HENRY, Maidstone June 11 Bracher, Maidstone
SAMUEL, MARY LOUISA, Sleaford, Lincs July 1 Millington & Simpson, Sleaford
SHELL, EDWARD, Paul, nr Penzance, Farmer Aug 1 East, Basinghall st
SHELL, NICHOLAS, St Just in Penwith, Penzance, Gardener Aug 1 East, Basinghall st
SOUTHEY, JAMES FREDERICK, Gt Yarmouth, Harness Maker June 18 Burton & Son, Gt Yarmouth
STAGO, JEREMY, Winchester June 29 Bailey & White, Winchester
THOMAS, WILLIAM, Surbiton July 24 Hamline & Co, Surbiton
THOMPSON JOHN, Gateshead, Joiner July 10 Rhazg, Newcastle upon Tyne
VANDERVELT, MICHAEL SEVVAAS, Lingfield rd, Wimbledon July 1 Lawrence & Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn
WESTMORE, WILLIAM THOMAS, Sunderland rd, Forest hill June 28 Armstrong, Forest hill
WHILDON, STEPHEN, Haycroft rd, Brixton hill July 5 Dees & Thompson, Newcastle upon Tyne
London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 31.
ALLEN, ALBERT EDWARD, Oxford July 6 Mallam & Co, Oxford
ALLEN, MARY, Malvern Link, Worcester June 24 Perry, Wolverhampton
ARNOLD, FREDERICK HUDSON, Hampstead July 11 Baker, St Helen's pl, Bishopsgate st
ATKINSON, SOPHIA, Malvern, Worcester June 22 Milne & Milne, Clement's inn
ATKINSON, WILLIAM, Beckenham, Civil Engineer June 29 R F & C L Smith, Lincoln's inn fields
ATTENBURY, ABRAHAM, West Timperley, Chester July 19 Lawson & Co, Manchester
BIRKS, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Solicitor July 24 Stamp & Co, Hull
BLUM, CARL ALFRED KNU, Gosforth, Northumberland July 13 Wilkinson & Marshall, Newcastle upon Tyne
BOTWRIGHT, WILLIAM FRANK, Gt Dover st, Plumber June 14 Huntley & Son, Tooley st, London Bridge
BRADY, JAMES, Hartgate, Colliery Agent July 7 Dodworth, Sheffield
BRENNER, DR GEORGE BEITH, West Croydon, MD July 8 Close & Co, Bloomsbury sq
BROADBENT, ELIZABETH, Skegness June 27 North & Co, Liverpool
CHAFFELL, JOHN, Brighton July 8 Hobbs & Young, Brighton
CHRYSTER, JAMES CHOMWELL, Eastbourne July 8 Child & Child, Sloane st
CLARE, SARAH, Monkwearmouth, Sunderland, Menage Dealer July 1 Huntly & Co, Sunderland
CLAUSON-THUR, WILLIAM, Wickham rd, Brockley June 29 Sandon & Co, High st, Deptford
COLE, HARRIET ELIZABETH, Brighton July 13 Fladgate & Co, Craige ct, Charing Cross
COLES, HARRIET, Wells, Somerset June 24 Norton & Wilson, Wells, Somerset
COOPER, ELIZABETH ANN, Pinxton Station, Notts July 1 Woolley & Hopkin, Derby
COOPER, WILLIAM, Weston park, Crouch End July 1 Snow & Co, Queen st
COPCUTT, THOMAS WILLIAM, Southend on Sea July 1 Myers, Wormwood st, Old Broad st
CORRY, ANNE, KIRKLEY, Suffolk July 7 Beers & Mayhew, Lowestoft
COWELL, CHARLOTTE MARIA, Seventh av, Manor Park June 20 Rawlinson & Son, New Broad st
CRINE, MARY ANN, Hastings July 6 Whittington & Co, Bishopsgate st Without
DASHWOOD, JAMES, Ryde, I of W, Timber Merchant, JP July 13 Eldridge & Sons, Newport
DAVIES, SARAH SADLER, Linslade, Bucks July 4 Watson, Shropport
DUMBLETON, CHARLES HARDLEY, Phoenix st, St Pancras, Doctor July 1 Fitz, Lower Seymour st, Exeter
DUNN, EDWARD, Dudley, Pork Butcher June 25 Hooper & Fairbairn, Dudley
ECCLES, RICHARD, Grindleton, Yorks, Labourer June 23 Lancaster, Blackburn
ENGEL, SAMUEL, Belisle Park July 15 Benjamin, Coleman st
FIRTH, DAN, Oakenshaw, Bradford, Brewer July 1 Clough & Crabtree, Cleckheaton
FRY, GEORGE FREDERICK, Dover June 29 Sandon & Co, High st, Deptford
GILES, LYDIA, Ashford, Kent June 22 Hallett & Co, Ashford
GOAD, LUCY ELLEN, Carshalton July 13 Collyer-Bristow & Co, Bedford row
GRAY, SALLY NIXON, Croydon June 19 Ince & Co, Finchurch st
HAYNE, ALFRED HENRY, Beccles, av, Streatham June 29 Gush & Co, Finsbury circus
HARRISON, MARGARET, Farnbridge villas, Baywater July 8 Hunter & Haynes, New sq, Lincoln's inn
HAZLEDINE, REV WILLIAM, Bristol July 8 Veale, Bristol
HELFEHENTRIK, JOSEPH, Twickenham July 13 Munns & Longden, Old Jewry
HETHERINGTON, ELLER, Chorlton on Medlock, Manchester July 1 Crofton & Co, Manchester

HOBNEY, MARGARET, Esq. Cockington, Torquay July 6 Pennington & Higson, Liverpool

HULAND, ELIZABETH, Biddlestone, Wills July 24 Phillips, Chippenham

LEWIS, GRITTE, Euston rd June 28 Stephens, Carmarthen

LANE, MARIE LOUISE, Southport July 10 Collins & Driffield, Liverpool

LIGHTFOOT, JOSEPH, Leverton, Lincs, Farmer July 22 Staniland & Son, Boston

LITHGOW, AMELIA ELIZABETH, Weston super Mare July 1 Ford, Weston super Mare

McDONNELL, WILLIAM ROBERT, Montague pl, Russell sq June 30 Arnold, Old Jewry

McDONALD, WALTER SCOTT, Fen ct, Fenchurch st June 24 Regge & Ackroyd, Finsbury circus

MADEN, LOUISE, Harwell June 29 Rawlinson & Son, New Broad st

MARGULES, CECIL, CB, Altin, Southampton July 1 Jackson, Farnham

MOORE, HARRIET, Penwortham, Preston, Lancs July 1 Woolley & Hopkin, Derby

MORRIS, CAROLINE ELIZABETH, Nottingham June 29 Hawkins & Co, Hitchin

MORRIS, ELISHA, Parkholme rd, Dalston, Boot Manufacturer July 1 Myers, Wormwood st, Old Broad st

MORRIS, HANNAH, Aston, Warwick June 15 Foster & Co, Birmingham

MORSE, JOHN, Llanfair, Montgomery, Collier July 4 Trehanne & Trehanne, Pentre, Pontypridd

NRAI, ROBERT, Sherston, Wills, Plumber June 30 Clark & Smith, Malmesbury

NUNNEY, CLARA, Clifton, Bristol July 13 Abbot & Co, Bristol

PATRIDGE, ELIZA, Tottenham July 20 G & W Webb, Devonshire sq

PATHEBON, ADAM BLACK, Beaumont ct June 28 Sandford & Co, Arundel st, Strand

PATHEBON, ROBERT COATS, Buenos Ayres, Argentina July 4 Bradley, Dover

POLLARD, FRANCIS, Southport June 30 Treways & Massey, Bradford

POWELL, FREDERICK ALBERT, Manchester sq, Doctor July 23 Fooks & Co, Carey st, Lincoln's inn

REAP, JAMES HILL, Milcote st, Blackfriars rd, Pattern Model Maker July 22 Hicklin & Co, Trinity sq, Southwark

REAY, THOMAS, Ladbroke June 15 Cartner & Milburn, Brompton

RICHARDS, EMMA LUCY, Bourne mouth June 30 Rowland, Bourne mouth

RIDLEY, SAMUEL JOHN, Newcastle upon Tyne, Wine Merchant July 10 Dees & Thompson, Newcastle upon Tyne

ROBERTSON, WILLIAM, Harcourt terr, South Kensington, Chartered Accountant July 15 Janson & Co, College hill

ROBINSON, JOHN, SWANSEA, June 29 Thomas, Swansea

SALT, REV SAMUEL, Dresden, Longton, Staffs July 14 Breton, Longton, Staffs

SCOTT, ELIZABETH SARAH, Kintbury, Berks Aug 1 Barnes, Kingsclere, Newbury

SEARAWCKE, SARAH ELIZABETH, Folkestone July 8 Bradley, Folkestone

SIBLEY, CAROLINE, Harlow, Essex July 1 Hart, Harlow, Essex

SMITH, SYDNEY ALFRED, Hednesford, Staffs, Draper June 24 Gardner & Sons, Rugeley

SMITH, WILLIAM MARSHALL, Little Houghton, Northampton July 1 J & C Matham, Northampton

SOUTHEY, ALBERT, Blindley Heath, South Godstone, Grocer July 1 Gorham & Co, Tonbridge

STOKES, PHILIP, Catshill, Shire Oak, Staffs, Yeoman July 8 Ashmall, Lichfield

TAYLOR, JOHNSON, Boston, Lincs, Builder July 22 Staniland & Son, Boston

TOMES, ELLEN, Hyde Park gds July 1 Edridge & Newnam, Croydon

TOWLE, ALLAN, Market Basin, Lincs, Wheelwright July 12 Frearson & Rainey, Market Basin

UNDERWOOD, ARTHUR, Reigate, Fruiterer June 3 Mole & Co, Reigate

VAUX, JOHN, Stockport, Horsekeeper July 1 Coppock & Helia, Stockport

VERNON, CATHERINE, Glanbury, June 24 Lowe & Co, Temple gds, Temple

WATSON, WALTER, Carlisle, Fish Dealer July 6 Burnett, Carlisle

WIDGERT, MARY ANN, Menston, Yorks July 1 Farrar, Halifax

WILSON, WILLIAM ELIAS, Euston rd, Builder June 28 Moon & Co, Lincoln's inn fields

WOLLEY, JOHN, Brize Norton, Oxford, Farmer July 5 Walsh & Co, Carfax, Oxford

YATES, ANNA MARIA, Bishop Sutton, Hants June 15 Shield & Mackerness, Alresford

ZELLER, HENRY, Liverpool June 23 Hosking, Liverpool

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, June 4.

ATKINS, LOUISE, Falcon rd, Clapham junc June 30 Fawcett, Arundel st, Strand

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 21.

ADJUDICATIONS.

BRAND, ARTHUR JAMES, Uxbridge rd, Shepherd's Bush, Coal Merchant High Court Pet May 21 Ord May 21

BROWN, JAMES CLIFFORD, Lewin rd, Streatham Common, Commission Agent High Court Pet March 23 Ord May 18

CLARK, HENRIET, Hurlingham, Music Hall Artist High Court Pet May 17 Ord May 17

DITCHFIELD, HENRY HODGSON, Fellowes rd, Hampstead, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet May 22 Ord May 22

ELLIS, JOHN, Midhurst, Sussex, Fishmonger Brighton Pet May 21 Ord May 21

FENNING, HENRY, Colchester, Licensed Victualler Colchester Pet May 7 Ord May 18

FULWELL, JOHN WILLIAM, Witherley, Leicester, Miller Birmingham Pet May 16 Ord May 16

GOLDSTEIN, JULIUS, Amburst rd, Hackney, Boot Manufacturer High Court Pet May 13 Ord May 18

GREENSTREET, JOHN JARVIS, Devonshire chmbrs, Bishopsgate st Without, Tanner High Court Pet May 13 Ord May 18

HALLIWELL, ALFRED, Farnworth, Lancs, Butcher Bolton Pet May 17 Ord May 17

HARBO, HENRY DAVES, 4, Broad st pl, Commission Agent High Court Pet Feb 12 Ord May 17

HEADLEY, JOHN MILNER, Gt Yarmouth, Newagent Gt Yarmouth Pet May 23 Ord May 23

HIGGINS, ROBERT N S, Seven Sisters rd, Islington High Court Pet April 24 Ord May 18

IRIN, JOHN ROBERT, Fosse, Salop, Draper Shrewsbury Pet May 22 Ord May 22

JENKINS, GEORGE, Exmouth st, Clerkenwell, Pork Butcher High Court Pet May 22 Ord May 23

KALLAWAY, ALBERT JOHN, Birmingham, Hot Water Engineer Birmingham Pet April 17 Ord May 16

KNOWLES, CHARLES CARPENTER, Levenshulme, Manchester, Commercial Clerk Manchester Pet May 17 Ord May 17

LINFORD, JAMES ARCHIBALD, Norwich, Laundry Proprietor Preston Pet May 18 Ord May 18

MILLERD, GEORGE HENRY, Portsmouth, Naval Contractor Portsmouth Pet May 18 Ord May 18

MILLS, WILLIAM EDWARD, and HENRY MILLS, Norwood, Builders Croydon Pet April 25 Ord May 21

MILNES, DAN, Bradford, Dealer in Worsteds Leeds Pet May 18 Ord May 18

NICHOLLS, WILLIAM HENRY, Charlottown, Cornwall, Ind-keeper Truro Pet May 18 Ord May 18

PHILLIPS, THOMAS, Penbriest, Rosebush, Pembroke, Mason Pembroke Dock Pet May 18 Ord May 18

ROBERTS, ROBERT, Peterborough, Draper Peterborough Pet May 22 Ord May 22

SCOTT, WILLIAM, Salfords, or Horley, Surrey, Contractor Croydon Pet May 21 Ord May 21

SMITH, ANNE AGNES, Shaftesbury Salisbury Pet April 15 Ord May 18

WELCH, HENRY JOHN, Southtown, Gt Yarmouth, Commission Agent Gt Yarmouth Pet May 21 Ord May 21

WESTLAKE, OLIVER, Gt College st, Camden Town, Vegetarian Blind Maker High Court Pet March 30 Ord May 16

WOOLGROVE, JAMES LEWIS, Plaistad rd, Upton Park, Essex, Builder High Court Pet May 21 Ord May 21

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 22.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

APPELGAATE, DANIEL, Worcester, Baker Worcester Pet May 23 Ord May 23

BODIN, HENRY ALEXANDER, Sandiland st, Red Lion st, Holborn, Builder High Court Pet April 15 Ord May 24

BROWNE, MATTHEW ALBERT, Stechford, Worcester, Commercial Traveller Birmingham Pet May 24 Ord May 24

BULMER, ROBERT, Westgate, Hounsea, Yorks, Grocer Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 23

COATES, JOHN, Stockton on Tees, Coach Builder Stockton on Tees Pet May 10 Ord May 23

COULTER, EDWIN, Greyhound ln, Streatham Common, Builder Wandsworth Pet April 25 Ord May 23

CROWE, JOHN, Mount Pleasant, Gateshead, Farmer Newcastle upon Tyne Pet May 24 Ord May 24

DAVIES, JOHN, Blenclydach, Glam, Haulier Pontypridd Pet May 23 Ord May 23

DRAPER, ALFRED, Strand, Hatter High Court Pet May 23 Ord May 24

DURHAM, PAUL EUGENE LOUIS, Gt Yarmouth, Motor Garage Proprietor Gt Yarmouth Pet April 23 Ord May 24

EDMONDSON, FLETCHER, West Jesmond, Newcastle on Tyne, Florist Newcastle on Tyne Pet May 10 Ord May 22

ELLIS, JULIUS SAMUEL, High st, Islington, Tailor High Court Pet May 23 Ord May 23

ERDE, MAX, Herne Bay, Kent, Hotel Keeper Canterbury Pet April 27 Ord May 11

FRANK & CO, A Paper st, Umbrella Manufacturers High Court Pet May 18 Ord May 23

HODGSON, ARCHIBALD, Leeds, Baker Leeds Pet May 23 Ord May 23

JOY, DOUGLAS GLOVER, Montague st High Court Pet March 13 Ord May 17

LARGTON, EDWARD CHARLES, Ilford, Coal Merchant Chelmsford Pet April 29 Ord May 23

LOGAN, ARCHIBALD, Kingston upon Hull, Cycle Maker Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 23

MARTIN, RALPH, Farnham, Hants, Draper Portsmouth Pet May 22 Ord May 22

MOORE, WILLIAM HENRY, Wallall, Accountant Wallall Pet May 7 Ord May 23

BARRETT, MARY AMINA, Frankley, Lancs June 28 Lacey & Co, Liverpool

BARRY, LOUISA, Redland, Bristol June 30 Binnott & Son, Bristol

BASTOCK, SARAH, Cuddington, Warwick, Coal Merchant July 5 Pasmann, Leamington

BELL, MARY, Maldon, Essex July 1 Crick & Freeman, Maldon

BISCOE, THOMAS, Tottenham July 6 Shelton, Lower Tottenham

BROWN, HENRY WILLIAM, Oulton Broad, nr Lowestoft, Fish Merchant June 8 Chamberlain, Lowestoft

BULLOCK, EDWIN, Henley on Thames July 13 Cooper & Son, Henley on Thames

CALCUTT, ALFRED MARTIN, Angell rd, Brixton June 25 B Calcutt, Chesterfield rd, Brixton

CALVERT, SAMUEL, Workop, Notts June 25 Clay, Workop

CHETWOOD-ALLEN, JOHN CHETWOOD, Stoke Bishop, Bristol July 13 Wansey & Meade-King, Bristol

COHEN, MARK, Sunderland, Pawabroker July 4 Ritson & Hope, Sunderland

COMFORT, HENRY, Whetstone June 30 Kingsford & Co, Essex st, Strand

COLLINGHAM, GEORGE, Dovercourt, Essex June 30 Ward & Hugh-Jones, Harwich

CURZON, FRANCIS, Burley in Wharfedale, Yorks July 5 Markland & Co, Leeds

DUMBLETON, CHARLES HARDLEY, Phoenix st, St Pancras, Doctor July 1 Fox, Lower Seymour st, Portman sq

FAULKNER, JOHN, Newtown, Beauchamp, Salop, Farmer July 12 Craig, Shrewsbury

GOFF, ALICE LOUISA, Canonbury July 23 Gush & Co, Finsbury circus

HERRING, GEORGE JOHN, Erdington, Warwick July 12 Wright & Marshall, Birmingham

HIPKINS, ELEANOR FRANCES, Clifton, Bristol July 16 Miller & Co, Bristol

HOBSON, MARY ELIZABETH, Bromborough, Chester June 29 Lacey & Co, Liverpool

HUNT, RICHARD WILLIAM, Scarborough July 6 W & W Drawbridge, Scarborough

JACK, ALEXANDER GORDON, Clapham rd, Canonbury July 16 Stock & Slater, Walbrook

JAMES, RUTH LASCARTER, Woolton, nr Litherley July 1 Batesons & Co, Liverpool

KENTISH, HORACE JOHN JAMES, Brompton sq July 23 Murray & Co, Birchin ln

LEACH, MARY ANN, Newport, Mon July 1 Howells, Newport, Mon

LOWATER, SAMUEL, Streatham June 24 Bottrill, Nottingham

MACKERRILL, CHARLES EDWARD GREGG, Dunningley, Balham Hill June 30 Fraser & Son, Southampton st, Bloomsbury

MACQUEEN, EMMA, Clapham Common June 29 Dawson & Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn

MAXFIELD, JOSEPH, Beeston, Notts June 6 Roke & Jackson, Nottingham

NAPIER-CLAVERING, REV JOHN WARREN, Blaydon on Tyne, Durham June 29 Clayton & Gibson, Newcastle upon Tyne

NEEDHAM, MARY, Brockley view, Forest hill July 8 Marsden & Co, Cavendish sq

NEVILL, THOMAS, West Heslton, Northumberland, Farmer July 30 Melrose & Fortescue, Coldstream

ODDEN, FRED, Manchester, Cloth Merchant July 2 Hadfield & Co, Manchester

PARISH, BENJAMIN, Brighton July 6 Lidiard & Co, Gt James st, Bedford row

PARROTT, FREDERICK BATFORD, Aylesbury July 1 J & T Parrott, Aylesbury

PENBERTON, JOSEPH, Herne Bay July 6 Lidiard & Co, Gt James st, Bedford row

PRATT, HODGSON, Sully le Poci, Seine et Oise, France July 30 Brown, Old Broad st

ROOKE, JOHN, Sheffield July 13 Rodgers & Co, Sheffield

ROOKE, MARY ANN, Bury, Lancs July 1 Bulcher & Barlow, Bury

SENIOR, FRANCES ELIZABETH, Doncaster July 3 Atkinson & Sons, Doncaster

STEPHENS, JOHN, Honicknowle, St Budoux, Devon June 24 France & France, Plymouth

STRETTON, NEVILLE, Liverpool, Coach Builder July 12 Gaskell, Liverpool

STUART, THE LADY CHARLOTTE, Aylesbury July 1 Hores & Co, Lincoln's inn fields

TAYLOR, RICHARD BRAMWELL, Southport July 6 Mawdale & Hadfield, Southport

TOMKINS, REV HENRY GEORGE, Weston super Mare July 1 Smith & Sons, Weston super Mare

WILLIAMS, ALFRED HENRY, Alcester July 1 Whalley & Son, Lincoln's inn fields

WILLIAMS, JOSHUA, Bourne mouth July 15 Piment & Co, Birmingham

WING, GEORGE, Salisbury July 12 King, Wilton, Salisbury

WINTER, JOHN NEWHAM, Lichfield rd, Kew Gardens, Surgeon July 1 Winter, Blomfield st

WOOD, ELIZABETH, Uttoxeter, Staffs July 10 Wilkins, Uttoxeter

WOOD, GEORGE, Southend on Sea, Essex June 30 Wood & Co, Southend on Sea

WOODWARD, KATHERINE CHARLOTTE, Bedford park, Chiswick July 6 Hensman & Marshall, Bedford row

MORGAN, WILLIAM, Llwydypia, Glam, Collier Pontypridd Pet May 23 Ord May 23

MORTIMER, HAPPY SAMUEL, Ipswich, Baker Bury St Edmunds Pet May 23 Ord May 23

MUMFORD, RONALD RAND, Teaster st, Camberwell, Chemical Apparatus Manufacturer High Court Pet March 13 Ord May 22

NICHOLSON, REGARRET, Newcastle on Tyne Newcastle on Tyne Pet May 23 Ord May 23

NORMAN, LEOPOLD ISIDORE NEUMANN, Hove, Sussex High Court Pet May 23 Ord May 23

POLLARD, JOHN HENRY, Belubus, Cornwall, Blacksmith Truro Pet May 23 Ord May 23

RIDDINGTON, JOSEPH, Littlethorpe, Nantworth, Leicester, Farmer Leicester Pet May 24 Ord May 24

SMALLWOOD, WILLIAM JOHN, Godham, Bedford, Motor Dealer Middleborough Pet May 23 Ord May 23

THOMAS, JAMES, Cwm-dare, Aberdare, Glam, Butcher Aberdare Pet May 23 Ord May 23

VON BUCH, CARL, Sun ct, Cornhill High Court Pet April 30 Ord May 23

WATNEY, RALPH REGINALD, Caxton st, Westminster High Court Pet May 1 Ord May 23

WILLIAMS, EDWIN, Mountain Ash, Glam, Milk Vender Aberdare Pet May 23 Ord May 23

WOOD, JOHN, Earsay, Kingston upon Hull, Grocer's Assistant Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 23

WOODLEY, EDWARD, Reading, Builder Reading Pet May 6 Ord May 24

ZIMMERMAN, JACOB, Wyndham rd, Camberwell, Baker High Court Pet May 1 Ord May 23

FIRST MEETINGS.

APPELGAATE, DANIEL, Worcester, Baker June 6 at 11.30 Off Rec, 11, Coppenhagen st, Worcester

ASCROFT, THOMAS HENRY, Colwyn Bay, Denbigh, Builder June 5 at 12.30 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

BAILEY, LYDIA EILEEN, and HENRY JOHN OATON, Leicester, Boot Manufacturers June 5 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester

BALDWIN, WILLIAM HENRY, Croydon, Builder June 5 at 11.30 139, York rd, Westminster Bridge

BAKERFIELD, FREDERICK, Newcastle upon Tyne, Staffs, Licensed Victualler June 6 at 11.30 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle, Staffs

BOWEN, DANIEL ROBERT, Hindley, Lancs, Physician June 6 at 3 19, Exchange st, Bolton

BRADBURN, GEORGE, Fleet, nr Oulton, Yorks, Miller's Assistant June 5 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

BRADBURN, WILLIAM, Osmark, Lancs, Coal Merchant June 5 at 13 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

COBOUT, WILLIAM, Warwick, Labourer June 6 at 11 Off Rec, 8, High st, Coventry

CROWE, JOHN, Mount Pleasant, Gateshead, Farmer June 5 at 11 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne

DAVIES, MARY FRANCES, Caswell Bay, nr Swansea June 5 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 DE BUISMORE, Viscount, Edwars sq, Kensington, Author June 6 at 13 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 DENNEY, WILLIAM THOMAS, Penrill, London, Fitter June 5 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 DITCHFIELD, HENRY HODGSON, Fellows rd, Hampstead, Commercial Traveller June 6 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 DRAPEL, ALFRED, Strand, Hatter June 10 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 EDMONDSON, FLETCHER, West Jeamond, Newcastle on Tyne, Florist June 5 at 12.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
 ELLIS, JULIUS SAMUEL, High st, Islington, Tailor June 7 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 ESMAN, EDWARD ISAAC, Billingham, Lines, Chemist June 7 at 13 Law Courts, Peterborough
 FLETCHER, JOSEPH, Coventry, Advertising Contractor June 6 at 12 Off Rec, 8, High st, Coventry
 FRANK & Co, A, Paper st, Umbrella Manufacturers June 6 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 FULWELL, JOHN WILLIAM, Witherley, Leicester, Miller June 5 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 GALLIFORD, DAVID, Pontefract, Glam, Posting Master June 5 at 10.30 Off Rec, County Court, Townhall, Metherly Tydd
 HODGSON, ARCHIBALD, Leeds, Baker June 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, 23, Park row, Leeds
 LANGTON, EDWARD CHARLES, Ilford, Coal Merchant June 5 at 12 14, Bedford row
 LOOSEMORE, ROBERT FRANCIS, Tiverton, Devon, Solicitor June 11 at 2 Off Rec, 9, Bedford circus, Exeter
 LUKINS, GEORGE, Clifton, Bristol, Bootmaker June 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 MARTIN, RALPH, West End, Farnham, Hants, Draper June 6 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth
 MILNER, DAVE, Bradford, Dealer in Worsted Coatings June 6 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
 MORRIS, JOHN, jun, South Shields, Stock Broker June 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
 MORTIMER, HAPPI SAMUEL, Ipswich, Baker June 5 at 2 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich
 MUMFORD, RONALD RAND, Feather st, Camberwell, Chemical Apparatus Manufacturer June 5 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 NICHOLSON, MARGARET, Newcastle on Tyne June 5 at 2.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
 NORMAN, LEOPOLD LEON SWANSON, Hove, Sussex June 5 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 OLD, BENJAMIN HIDE, Bristol, Baker June 5 at 12 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 OWEN, ROBERT, South Shore, Blackpool, Boot Maker June 5 at 11 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 PASTING, ANNIE, Newport, Mon, Tailor June 7 at 12 Off Rec, 144, Commercial st, Newport, Mon
 PHILLIPS, THOMAS, Pembroke, Pembrokeshire, Mason June 7 at 1 Pembroke Hall, Pembroke Dock
 POLLARD, JOHN HENRY, Ralubus, Cornwall, Blacksmith June 6 at 12 Off Rec, Boscastle st, Truro
 POTTS, ERNEST SHALMANER, and HERBERT FREDERICK TERRY, Sunderland, Metal Dealers June 5 at 2 Off Rec, 3, Manor pl, Sunderland
 ROBINSON, FRED, Whitcliffe, Cambridge, Hawker June 7 at 11.45 Law Courts, Peterborough
 ROLLINGS, JOHN CLARKE, Nottingham, Cotton Waste Dealer June 5 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
 SCOTT, WILLIAM, Salford, nr Horley, Surrey, Builder June 6 at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 STANLEY, ERNEST EGERTON PARNIVAL, Port Sunlight, Chester, Assistant Superintendent of Fire Brigade June 5 at 12.30 Off Rec, 25, Victoria st, Liverpool
 TASH, HENRY OTWALD, Wilsbeck, Cambridgeshire, Baker June 5 at 12 Off Rec, 3, King st, Norwich
 VOI BUCH, CARL, Sun st, Cornhill June 5 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 WATNEY, RALPH REGINALD, Caxton st, Westminster June 6 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 WILLIAMS, ROBERT, Shop Newydd, Llanfairtalhaiarn, Denbigh, Grocer June 5 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
 WOOD, JOHN ERNEST, Kingston upon Hull, Grocer's Assistant June 6 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House in, Hull
 ZIMMERMAN, JACOB, Wyndham rd, Camberwell, Baker June 5 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADYE, OSCAR ARTHUR, College st, Hammersmith, Actor High Court Pet May 15 Ord May 24
 APTHEGATE, DARLINE, Worcester, Baker Worcester Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 BALDWIN, WILLIAM HENRY, Croydon, Builder Croydon Pet May 15 Ord May 25
 BROOKS, WILLIAM DOLMAN, Bishops' Itchington, Warwick, Farmer Warwick Pet April 25 Ord May 23
 BULMER, ROBERT, Horseshoe, York, Grocer Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 25
 COATES, JOHN, Stockton on Tees, Coach Builder Stockton on Tees Pet May 10 Ord May 23
 COUNTER, ARTHUR FREDERICK, St Stephen's chmbrs, Telegraph st, Stock Broker High Court Pet April 15 Ord May 31
 DAVIES, JAMES OWEN, Aberayon, Cardigan, Cycle Dealer Aberystwyth Pet May 15 Ord May 23
 DAVIES, JOHN, Bessydale, Glam, Haulier Pontypridd Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 ELLIS, JULIUS SAMUEL, High st, Islington, Tailor High Court Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 GREGORY, GEORGE, Mining in, Sugar Broker High Court Pet April 16 Ord May 25
 HODGSON, ARCHIBALD, Leeds, Baker Leeds Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 IRVINE, THOMAS TERRY, and FENTON IRVINE, Liverpool, Commission Agents Liverpool Pet March 28 Ord May 23
 JONES, EDWIN, Cilmercy, nr Bullth, Brecon, Grocer Newtown Pet May 10 Ord May 23
 LEWIS, HERBERT ARCHDEACON, Birmington, Auctioneer Canterbury Pet May 8 Ord May 24
 LUGAN, ARCHIBALD, Kingston upon Hull, Cycle Maker Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 MARTIN, RALPH, Farnham, Hants, Draper Portsmouth Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 MAYES, EDWARD, Wellesley rd, Ilford, Coal Merchant High Court Pet April 11 Ord May 22
 MORRIS, WILLIAM, Llynwypia, Glam, Collier Pontypridd Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 MORTIMER, HAPPI SAMUEL, Ipswich, Baker Bury St Edmunds Pet May 22 Ord May 22
 OLD, BENJAMIN HIDE, Bristol, Baker Bristol Pet May 16 Ord May 23
 POLLARD, JOHN HENRY, Ralubus, Cornwall, Blacksmith Truro Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 PRING, CHARLES HOOPER, and CHARLES THOMAS CARTER, Chandos av, South Maling, Builders Brentford Pet March 27 Ord May 23
 READING, CHARLES HENRY, Upper st, Islington, Costumier High Court Pet April 20 Ord May 22
 RIDDINGTON, JOSEPH, Liddlethorpe, Northborough, Leicester, Farmer Leicester Pet May 24 Ord May 24
 THOMAS, JAMES, Cwmdare, Aberdare, Glam, Butcher Aberdare Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 WHITE, GEORGE ALLEN, York, Accountant York Pet May 4 Ord May 24
 WILLIAMS, EDWIN, Mountain Ash, Glam, Milk Vendor Aberdare Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 WILSON, SARAH ELIZABETH, Bournemouth, Court Dressmaker Poole Pet May 16 Ord May 25
 WOOD, JOHN ERNEST, Kingston upon Hull, Grocer's Assistant Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 23
 WOOD, REGINALD WILLIAM, Sussex sq, Hyde Park High Court Pet March 2 Ord May 23

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 31.
 RECEIVING ORDERS.
 ANDERSON, F H, Hyde Park chmbrs, Knightsbridge High Court Pet Feb 2 Ord May 25
 BELLOROV, GEORGE AUGUSTUS FREDERICK EDWARD WILKINS, Fulham Palace rd, Florist High Court Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 BENJAMIN, A, Manchester av, Merchant High Court Pet April 23 Ord May 27
 BENNETT, WILLIAM, West Norwood, Surrey, Wine Merchant High Court Pet May 16 Ord May 23
 BENNETT, ISAAC, Portsea, Portsmouth, Tailor Portsmouth Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 BAAT, HERBERT EDWARD, Woolwich, House Furnisher Greenwich Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 BEGG, STANLEY, Hammersmith, Hotel Manager High Court Pet April 30 Ord May 27
 COHEN, MYLIUS, Bucklersbury, Financier High Court Pet March 12 Ord May 25
 EDMONDSON, JOSEPH, jun, West Hartlepool, Railway Clerk Sunderland Pet May 25 Ord May 25

FARROW, EDWARD HENRY, Stechford, Worcester, Traveller Birmingham Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 GARDUTT, GEORGE, Stockton on Tees, Master Bricklayer Stockton on Tees Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 GLASWELL, JAMES, Thrusmore, Yorks, Tailor Sheffield Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 HART, JAMES, Wigan, Coal Merchant Wigan Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 HARTNEY, HENRY THOMAS MACK, Burslem Broom, Norfolk, Grocer Norfolk Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 HODGSON, RICHARD, Houghton le Spring, Durham, Mineral Water Manufacturer Durham Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 HUGHES, ALEXANDER, Dissbury, Lancs, Paister Manchester Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 INNESWOOD, ELLIS, Blackburn, Cabinet Maker Blackburn Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 MARTIN, RICHARD, and FRANK LANE MARTIN, Spilay, Lines, Blacksmiths Boston Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 MEYERS, JOSEPH, Chesham, Manchester, Tailor Salford Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 MORRIS, THOMAS, Carlisle, Caldonian rd, Cab Proprietor High Court Pet May 9 Ord May 25
 NORTH, CHARLES, Manby grove, Stratford, Builder High Court Pet May 10 Ord May 25
 NORRIS, BENJAMIN WILLIAM, Uley, Glou, Butcher Gloucester Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 PHILLIPS, JOHN, Trocynon, Aberdare, Glam, Colliery Labourer Aberdare Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 PICKUP, JOHN GEORGE, Accrington, Lancs, Joiner Blackburn Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 RAINBOW, FREDERICK, Southsea, Hants Portsmouth Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 RICHARDS, CHARLES, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Builder Nottingham Pet May 18 Ord May 27
 RICHARDS, STEPHEN EDMUND, Bristol, Printer and Stationer Bristol Pet May 27 Ord May 27
 ROBERT, DAVID, Hopper's rd, Palmer's Green, Grocer Edmonstone Pet May 7 Ord May 25
 ROSSON, JAMES SIDNEY, Eton, Chester, Farmer Macclesfield Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 SAMUEL, HARRY LEON, and ROBERT ROSE WALTER, Manchester, Smallware Dealers Manchester Pet May 15 Ord May 25
 SMITH, SIDNEY ALBERT, Exeter, Hairdresser Exeter Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 STYTON, HERBERT, Macclesborough, Yorks, Tramway Clerk Sheffield Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 TOMLIN, PHILIP, Small Heath, Birmingham, Grocer Birmingham Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 TOZER, SAMUEL, Dnoy, Newton Abbot, Devon, Dairyman Exeter Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 WILKINSON, JOSEPH, Morecombe, Coach Painter Preston Pet May 25 Ord May 25
 WILLIAMS, DAVID HENRY, Menai Bridge, Anglesey, Licensed Victualler Bangor Pet May 25 Ord May 25

FIRST MEETINGS.
 ANDERSON, F H, Hyde Park chmbrs, Knightsbridge June 11 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 BENJAMIN, A, Manchester av, Merchant June 10 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 BENNETT, WILLIAM, West Norfolk, Wine Merchant June 11 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 BODIER, HENRY ALEXANDER, Handland st, Red Lion st, Holborn, Builder June 10 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 BRIGGS, STANLEY, Brook Green Hotel, Hammersmith, Hotel Manager June 11 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 BROWN, MATTHEW ALBERT, Stechford, Worcester, Commercial Traveller June 10 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 BULMER, ROBERT, Horseshoe, Yorks, Grocer June 6 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House in, Hull
 COHEN, MYLIUS, Bucklersbury, Financier June 14 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 DAVIES, HENRY CHARLES, Edgware, Licensed Victualler June 11 at 12 14, Bedford row
 DAVIES, JOHN, Bessydale, Glam, Haulier June 11 at 10.30 Post Office chmbrs, Pontypridd
 FARROW, EDWARD HENRY, Stechford, Traveller June 12 at 11.30 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 HART, JAMES, Wigan, Coal Merchant June 11 at 3 Court house, Crawford st, Wigan
 HEADLEY, JOHN MILNER, St Yarmouth, Newagent June 8 at 12 Off Rec, 3, King st, Norwich
 HILL, ARTHUR, Preston, Confectioner June 10 at 11 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston

THE LICENSERS' INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED.

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ESTABLISHED IN 1891.

EXCLUSIVE BUSINESS—LICENSED PROPERTY.

X

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

630 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation.

X

Suitable Insurance Clauses for Inserting in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property Settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

HUGHES, ALEXANDER, Didsbury, Painter June 8 at 10.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
JOY, DOUGLAS GLOVER, Montague st June 10 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
KNOWLES, CHARLES CARPENTER, Levenshulme, nr Manchester, Commercial Clerk June 8 at 11 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
KNOWLES, JOHN, Brinkdale, nr Southport, Grocer June 10 at 11.30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
LAW, CLEMENTINE, Emma, Gloucester, Corn Merchant June 8 at 3 Bell Hotel, Gloucester
LOCKWOOD, WALTER, Longridge, nr Preston, Licensed Victualler June 10 at 11.15 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
LUCAS, ARCHIBALD, Kingston upon Hull, Cycle Maker June 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, Trinity House ln, Hull
MEYERS, JOSEPH, Cheetham, Manchester, Tailor June 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
MORGAN, WILLIAM, Llynypia, Glamorgan, Collier June 11 at 11 Post Office chmbrs, Pontypidd
PARKINSON, BENJAMIN JOSEPH, Burnley, Lancs, Draper June 10 at 11.45 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
PEARCE, HENRY L., Chatham June 10 at 11.30 115, High st, Rochester
PRICE, WILLIAM, Ludlow, Salop, Grocer June 11 at 1 4, Corn st, Leominster
RIDDINGTON, JOSEPH, Littlethorpe, Netherborough, Leicester, Farmer June 10 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
ROOSES, RICHARD, Wrexham, Denbigh, Innkeeper June 10 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
ROXBIE, DAVID, Hoppers rd, Palmers Green, Grocer June 8 at 11 14, Bedford row
SMITH, SYDNEY ALBERT, Exeter, Hairdresser June 11 at 13 Off Rec, 9, Bedford circus, Exeter
THOMAS, JAMES, Cwmadere, Aberdare, Glam, Butcher June 11 at 11.15 Post Office chmbrs, Pontypidd
TOZER, SAMUEL, Decoy, Newton Abbot, Devon, Dairyman June 11 at 12 Off Rec, 9, Bedford circus, Exeter
WHEELDALE, FRANK JOHN, Bedford, Grocer June 11 at 10.30 Shirehall, Bedford
WILLIAMS, EDWIN, Mountain Ash, Glam, Milk Vendor June 11 at 11.45 Post Office chmbrs, Pontypidd
WOODLEY, EDWARD, Reading, Builder June 13 at 12 Queen's Hotel, Reading

ADJUDICATIONS.

ASCROFT, THOMAS HENRY, Colwyn Bay, Denbigh, Builder Bangor Pet April 12 Ord May 28
BELLOVOE, GEORGE AUGUSTUS, FREDERICK EDWARD WILKIN, Fulham Palace rd, Florist High Court Pet May 29 Ord May 28
BERNSTEIN, ISAAC, Landport, Portsmouth, Tailor Portsmouth Pet May 27 Ord May 27
BISHOP, FREDERICK JAMES, Farnham, Licensed Victualler Guildford Pet May 27 Ord May 27
BRADSHAW, GEORGE, Fines, nr Oulton, Yorks, Corn Merchant Leeds Pet May 9 Ord May 25
BRAY, HENRY EDWARD, Woolwich, House Furnisher Greenwich Pet May 28 Ord May 28
BROWNE, MATTHEW ALBERT, Stechford, Worcester, Commercial Traveller Birmingham Pet May 24 Ord May 27
BUTTANT, WILLIAM HENRY, Goxford, Kidlington, Oxford, Farmer Oxford Pet May 28 Ord May 27
DUBIAN, PAUL EUGENE LOUIS, Gt Yarmouth, Motor Garage Proprietor Gt Yarmouth Pet April 23 Ord May 28
EDMONDSON, FLETCHER, West Jesmond, Newcastle on Tyne, Florist Newcastle on Tyne Pet May 10 Ord May 27
EDMONDSON, JOSEPH, jun, West Hartlepool, Railway Clerk Sunderland Pet May 28 Ord May 28
FARROW, EDWARD HENRY, Stechford, Worcester, Traveller Birmingham Pet May 27 Ord May 28
GARRUTT, GEORGE, Stockton on Tees, Master Bricklayer Stockton on Tees Pet May 25 Ord May 25
GLANVILLE, JAMES, Thruscombe, Yorks, Tailor Sheffield Pet May 29 Ord May 29
HARVEY, JAMES, Wigan, Coal Merchant Wigan Pet May 28 Ord May 28
HARDYMENT, HENRY THOMAS MACE, Barnham Broom, Norfolk, Grocer Norwich Pet May 27 Ord May 27
HODGSON, RICHARD, Houghton le Spring, Mineral Water Manufacturer Durham Pet May 27 Ord May 27
HUGHES, ALEXANDER, Didsbury, Painter Manchester Pet May 27 Ord May 27
ISHWOOD, ELLER, Blackburn, Cabinet Maker Blackburn Pet May 27 Ord May 27
JACKSON, NATHAN, Fenton, Staffs, Van Man Stoke upon Trent Pet May 11 Ord May 29
LANGTON, EDWARD CHARLES, Ilford, Coal Merchant Chelmsford Pet April 29 Ord May 25
MARTIN, RICHARD, and FRANK LAWE MARTIN, Spilby, Lincs, Blacksmith Boston Pet May 28 Ord May 28
MEYERS, JOSEPH, Cheetham, Manchester, Tailor Salford Pet May 27 Ord May 28
NICHOLSON, MARGARET, Newcastle on Tyne Newcastle on Tyne Pet May 25 Ord May 25
NORRIS, BENJAMIN WILLIAM, Uley, Gloucester, Butcher Gloucester Pet May 28 Ord May 28
PAINTEY, GEORGE, Thorpebank rd, Usbridge rd High Court Pet April 18 Ord May 29
PARRY, JOHN EDWIN, and JOSEPH VICKERS, Somerville, Liscard, Builders Birkenhead Pet April 25 Ord May 28
PHILLIPS, JOHN, Treogym, Aberdare, Glam, Colliery Labourer Aberdare Pet May 27 Ord May 27
PICKER, JOHN GEORGE, Acorngrange, Joiner Blackburn Pet May 27 Ord May 27
RAINBOW, FREDERICK, Southsea, Hants Portsmouth Pet May 29 Ord May 29
RICHARDS, STEPHEN EDWARD, Bristol, Printer Bristol Pet May 27 Ord May 27
ROSSON, JAMES SIDNEY, Baton, Chester, Farmer Macclesfield Pet May 28 Ord May 28
SHORLAND, JAMES BOWEN, Mangotsfield, Gloucester, Builder Bristol Pet Dec 4, 1905 Ord May 27
SMALLWOOD, WILLIAM, JOHN, Cusham, Redcar, Cycle Dealer Middlesbrough Pet April 28 Ord May 27
SHEPHERD, JOSEPH HENRY, and GEORGE BOOTH, Leicester, Carters Leicester Pet April 3 Ord May 29

SMITH, SYDNEY ALBERT, Exeter, Hairdresser Exeter Pet May 28 Ord May 28
STRETON, HENRY, Mashborough, Yorks, Clerk Sheffield Pet May 29 Ord May 29
TOZER, SAMUEL, Decoy, Newton Abbot, Devon, Dairyman Exeter Pet May 29 Ord May 29
TURNER, EDWIN ALEXANDER, Mayow rd, Forest hill, Palace Green, Greenwich Pet Feb 22 Ord May 29
WHEELDALE, FRANK JOHN, Bedford, Grocer Bedford Pet May 22 Ord May 27
WILKINSON, JOSEPH, Morcombe, Coach Painter Preston Pet May 29 Ord May 29
WILLIAMS, DAVID HENRY, Menai Bridge, Anglesey, Licensed Victualler Bangor Pet May 28 Ord May 28
Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of May 7:
SMART, JOHN GORDON, Regent's Park terr, Regent's Park, Architect's Clerk High Court Pet May 2 Ord May 3

ADJUDICATIONS ANNULLED.

MILLER, ROY GEORGE, Radway, Warwick Banbury Adjud Aug 25, 1903 Annul Feb 22, 1907
NICHOLSON, CHARLES WILLIAM, Blackpool, Commercial Traveller Preston Adjud Nov 19, 1906 Annul April 30, 1907

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, June 4.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADLARD, HAROLD DEYDALE, Gainsborough, Builder Lincoln Pet May 29 Ord May 29
ALLEN, JOHN THOMAS, Leicester, Plumber Leicester Pet May 18 Ord June 1
BANKS, CHARLES, Seaford, Sussex, Sub-Postmaster Lewes Pet May 31 Ord May 31
BIRKS, WILLIAM THOMAS, Gutter ln, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet May 30 Ord May 30
BISHOP, GEORGE THOMAS COOK, Boodle, Lancs, Seedsman Liverpool Pet June 1 Ord June 1
CAMPBELL, ARTHUR, Manchester, Accountant Manchester Pet April 9 Ord May 30
COOKE, WALTER HENRY, Grayshot, Hants, Hotel Manager Guildford Pet May 29 Ord May 29
CROW, ALFRED, Pemberton gds, Upper Holloway, Stone Merchant's Manager High Court Pet June 1 Ord June 1
CYRUS, SYLVESTER, Burnley, Weaver Burnley Pet May 31 Ord May 31
EVANS, SARAH JANE, Llandudno, Lodging house Keeper Bangor Pet May 31 Ord May 31
FISHER, WILLIAM THOMAS HENRY, Abingdon, Berks, Music Seller Oxford Pet May 31 Ord May 31
GREENWOOD, WILLIAM MARTIN, Ashton on Mersey, Chester, Commercial Traveller Manchester Pet April 30 Ord May 29
GROGAN, ARCHIBALD, Jermyn st High Court Pet Feb 12 Ord May 24
HEWLEY, WILLIAM GRAFTON, Sheffield, Grocer Sheffield Pet May 8 Ord May 30
HOLDEN, THOMAS, Bristol, Licensed Victualler Bristol Pet May 31 Ord May 31
INNES, WILLIAM BALCHIN, Boston, Lincs, Merchant Boston Pet April 10 Ord May 29
KIRK, MARY A., Greenheys, Manchester, Stationer Manchester Pet May 1 Ord May 30
KIRTLAND, WILLIAM, Weston Turville, Bucks, Farrier Aylesbury Pet May 30 Ord May 31
KNAPMAN, FREDERICK, Stonehouse, Devon, Carter Plymouth Pet May 3 Ord May 31
MCGAW, JOHN, Wilmore, Stratford on Avon, Farmer Crowe Pet May 1 Ord May 29
MARLOW, WILLIAM, St Martin's ln, Charing Cross, Licensed Victualler Chelmsford Pet May 8 Ord May 29
MATTHEWS, H G, Chatsworth rd, Clapton, Provision Dealer High Court Pet May 4 Ord May 29
O'LEARY, JAMES SLINGSBY, Darlington, Grocer Stockton on Tees Pet May 16 Ord May 29
PALMER, WILLIAM JOHN ARTHUR, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Plumber Carmarthen Pet May 31 Ord May 31
PARTINGTON, JAMES, Halifax, Fish Salesman Halifax Pet May 29 Ord May 29
PEARCE, JOHN, Kea, Cornwall, Labourer Truro Pet June 1 Ord June 1
PERRY, WILLIAM, Long Ashton, Somerset, Tanner Bristol Pet May 31 Ord May 31
ROBERTS, ROBERT ISAAC, Deganwy, Carnarvon, Carriage Proprietor Bangor Pet May 31 Ord May 31
ROBINSON, CLIFFORD, Forchester Gate High Court Pet May 6 Ord May 30
SIDDIKIAN GOLD SHARE INVESTMENT SYNDICATE, London wall High Court Pet April 3 Ord May 30
SKUCE, JOHN, Oxford, Butcher Oxford Pet May 31 Ord May 31
STRETON, INNES MCGAW, Ilford Chelmsford Pet May 29 Ord May 29
STUBERT, JAMES, East Lulworth, Wareham, Grocer Poole Pet May 30 Ord May 30
VADGAM, DAVID, Walsworth, Ynsyhir, Glam, Colliery Oulter Pontypidd Pet May 29 Ord May 29
WHEELER, HENRY, Aston Manor, Warwick, Upholsterer Birmingham Pet May 31 Ord May 31
WHEELER, JAMES EDWARD, New Malden, Surrey, Commercial Traveller Kingston, Surrey Pet May 30 Ord May 30
WIGGINS, JAMES, Charles pl, East Acton, Fat Contractor Brentford Pet May 3 Ord May 31
WILCE, GEORGE, Pentrebach, Merthyr Tydfil, Collier Merthyr Tydfil Pet May 31 Ord May 31
WOOD, EMOC, Blackside, Wilms, Stuff Merchant Bradford Pet May 31 Ord May 31
YEATES, DAVID, Cockfield, Durham Stockton on Tees Pet May 31 Ord May 31

FIRST MEETINGS.

BELLOVOE, GEORGE AUGUSTUS, FREDERICK EDWARD WILKIN, Fulham Palace rd, Florist June 13 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
BERNSTEIN, ISAAC, Portsea, Portsmouth, Tailor June 12 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth

BIRKS, WILLIAM THOMAS, Gutter ln, Licensed Victualler June 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
BRAY, HENRY EDWARD, Woolwich, House Furnisher June 14 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg (Room 53), Carey st
COATES, JOHN, Stockton on Tees, Coachbuilder June 13 at 11 Royal Hotel, Stockton on Tees
COULY, HENRY HAROLD, Greyhound ln, Streatham Common, Builder June 12 at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
DUBIAN, PAUL EUGENE LOUIS, Gt Yarmouth, Motor Garage Proprietor June 14 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
ENRIKLMANN, JEAN, Marple, Cheshire, Foreign Correspondent June 13 at 11 Off Rec, Castle chmbrs, 6 Vernon st, Stockport
GARRUTT, GEORGE, Stockton on Tees, Master Bricklayer June 13 at 11 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
HARDYMENT, HENRY THOMAS MACE, Barnham Broom, Norfolk, Grocer June 14 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
HODGSON, RICHARD, Houghton le Spring, Durham, Mineral Water Manufacturer June 13 at 3.30 Off Rec, 8, Manor pl, Sunderland
JACKSON, NATHAN, Fenton, Staffs, Vanman June 13 at 11.30 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle, Staffs
MATTHEWS, H G, Chatsworth rd, Clapton, Provision Dealer June 17 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
MORRIS, THOMAS, Carlisle st, Caledonian rd, Cab Proprietor June 17 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
NORRIS, BENJAMIN WILLIAM, Uley, Gloucester, Butcher June 13 at 11 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester
NORRIS, CHARLES, Manby Grove, Stratford, Builder June 12 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
PALMER, WILLIAM JOHN ARTHUR, Llanelly, Plumber June 12 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
PARRY, JOHN EDWIN, and JOSEPH VICKERS, Liscard, Chester, Builders June 12 at 13 Off Rec, 25, Victoria st, Liverpool
PARTINGTON, JAMES, Halifax, Fish Salesman June 17 at 12 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax
RAINBOW, FREDERICK, Southsea, Hants June 12 at 4 Off Rec, Cambridge junc, High st, Portsmouth
RICHARDS, CHARLES, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Builder June 12 at 3 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
ROBERTS, ROBERT, Peterborough, Draper June 14 at 11.35 The Law Courts, Peterborough
ROBINSON, CLIFFORD, Forchester Gate June 14 at 13 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
SIDDIKIAN GOLD SHARE INVESTMENT SYNDICATE, London wall June 14 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
SMALLWOOD, WILLIAM JOHN, Cusham, Redcar, Yorks, Motor Dealer June 12 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
STURNEY, JAMES, East Lulworth, Wareham, Dorset, Grocer June 12 at 2.30 Messrs Curds & Son, Market pl, Poole
WIGGINS, JAMES, Charles pl, East Acton, Fat Contractor June 12 at 12 14, Bedford row
WILLIAMS, DAVID HENRY, Menai Bridge, Anglesey, Licensed Victualler June 13 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER with regularity it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher, at 27, Chancery-lane.

SELDEN SOCIETY.

FOUNDED 1887.

To encourage the study and advance the knowledge of the History of English Law.

PATRON: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

PRESIDENT: SIR ROBERT ROMER, G.C.B.

VICE-PRESIDENTS: LORD COLLINS.

VICE-PRESIDENTS: MR. RICHARD PENNINGTON, J.P.

COUNCIL.

MR. HENRY ATTLES. Sir JOHN GRAY HILL.
MR. J. T. ATKINSON. Mr. JUSTICE JOYCE.
MR. W. PALLEY BAILDON. Sir H. MAXWELL LYTT.
MR. JUSTICE CHANNELL. Sir F. POLLOCK, Bt.
MR. A. T. CARTER. Mr. RENSFELD, K.C.
LORD JUSTICE FARWELL. Prof. VINGROD.
MR. CHADWICK HEALY, K.C. Mr. T. CYPRIAN WILLIAMS.
Sir ALFRED WILLS.

Hon. Secretary: MR. B. FOSSETT LOCK,

11, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

Hon. Treasurer: MR. FRANCIS K. MUSTON,

Montpelier House, Twickenham.

Annual Subscription: ONE GUINEA. Life Membership (or 30 years for Libraries, &c.): TWENTY GUINEAS.
Each member receives the publication for the year of subscription, and may subscribe for any previous year.
Public Libraries, &c., becoming subscribers and requiring a complete set of past Publications may receive same at a special rate.

Further particulars may be obtained from the Secretary or Treasurer.

NOTE.—Publications already issued (price 28s. each to Non-Members): (I.) Select Pleas of the Crown. (II.) Select Manorial Pleas. (III.) Select Civil Pleas. (IV.) The Court Baron. (V.) Lect Jurisdiction in Norwich. (VI.) Select Admiralty Pleas (Vol. 1.). (VII.) The Mirror of Justices. (VIII.) Bracton and Azo. (IX.) The Coroners' Rolls. (X.) Select Cases in Chancery. (XI.) Select Admiralty Pleas (Vol. 2.). (XII.) The Court of Requests. (XIII.) Select Pleas of the Forests. (XIV.) Beverley Town Documents. (XV.) The Exchequer of the Jews. (XVI.) The Star Chamber. (XVII.) Year Books 1 & 2 Ed. 1. (XVIII.) Borough Customs (Vol. 1.). (XIX.) Year Books (Vol. 2.) 2 & 3 Ed. 2. (XX.) Year Books (Vol. 3.) 3 Ed. 1. XXI. Borough Customs (Vol. 2.).

1907.

ed Victual
t
ss Furnish
63, Carey
June 12
ham Common
Westminster

Motor Garage
5, King st.
reign Caste
le chmbrs, 6

ter Bricklay
llesbrough
ham Broom
5, King st.
ham, Miners
Off Rec, 6

June 13
on, Providen
ss, Carey st
rd, Cab Pro
4, Carey st
cher June 13

Builder June
lumber June
n
ms, Liscard,
e, 85, Victoria

June 17 at 13

ne 12 at 4 Off
th
otta, Builder
s, Nottingham

ne 14 at 11.55
at 12 Bank
CATH, London
Carey st
edon, Yorks,
8, Albert rd,

Dorset, Grocer
arket pl, Poole
at Contractor
ge, Anglesey,
Crypt chmbrs,

procuring
WEEKLY
requested that
Publisher, of

TY.

of the History

ING.
G.C.B.

NGTON, J.P.

r HILL.

RYCE.

BLE LYTH.

x, Bart.

, K.C.

ADOFF.

N WILLIAMS.

CK,

's-inn, W.C.

UNTON,

Wickenham.

Membership

GUINEAS.

or the year of

previous year,

rs and requir-

receive same at

Secretary or

e 28s. each to

rn. (II.) Select

IV.) The Court

(VI) Select

or of Justices.

roners' Rolls.

irect Admiralty

ness. (XIII)

y Town Doc-

(XVI.) The

& 2 Ed. 2.

Year Books

ol. 3) 3 Ed. 1.